

ORBIT - Online Repository of Birkbeck Institutional Theses

Enabling Open Access to Birkbeck's Research Degree output

Between the commemorative games and the descent to the Underworld in Books 5 and 6 of Vergil's Aeneid: a study of structure and narrative technique in the transition

<https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/40202/>

Version: Full Version

Citation: Powell,, David John (2017) Between the commemorative games and the descent to the Underworld in Books 5 and 6 of Vergil's Aeneid: a study of structure and narrative technique in the transition. [Thesis] (Unpublished)

© 2020 The Author(s)

All material available through ORBIT is protected by intellectual property law, including copyright law.

Any use made of the contents should comply with the relevant law.

[Deposit Guide](#)
Contact: [email](#)



**Between the commemorative games and the descent to the Underworld
in Books 5 and 6 of Vergil's *Aeneid*: a study of structure and narrative
technique in the transition**

Thesis submitted in September 2016 by:

David John Powell

awarded the degree of Master of Philosophy

February 2017

Declaration

I hereby certify that the work presented in this thesis is my own work.



.....

David John Powell

DEDICATIO

**Hunc librum dedico:
et memoriae mulieris amatae Mariae
et filio dilecto Antonio.**

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank my supervisor, Professor Catharine Edwards, for her prudent suggestions throughout. Also my son, Anthony, and daughter-in-law, Julia, both Cambridge classics graduates, for their consistent encouragement. Any and all shortcomings are my own.

Abstract

Book 5 of Vergil's *Aeneid* is known for the games commemorating the first anniversary of Anchises' death; Book 6 for Aeneas' visit to the Underworld. Each of these major episodes offers a fairly homogeneous narrative, the former describing the Trojans relaxing, the latter didactic and philosophical. Connecting these two extended episodes are 529 lines (5.604-6.261) in which twelve heterogeneous scenes, mostly short, effect modulation from a superficially happy atmosphere to one of solemnity. This thesis considers this 'Transitional Section' as a single coherent unit, spanning the weak division between Books 5 and 6.

In fulfilling the principal function of transition, the twelve scenes provide recapitulation of important themes for (re-)readers and preparation for what is to come both for (re-)readers and for Aeneas and the *Aeneadae*. After the Introduction, individual scenes or groups of scenes are analysed in five chapters. Chapter 2 considers whether the rôle of the Olympian gods, returning to centre-stage after a lengthy absence, can be demythologized, finding established interpretations not entirely satisfactory. Chapter 3 challenges interpretation of the loss and subsequent death of the helmsman Palinurus as a 'sacrifice'. Chapter 4 examines historical and political symbolism underlying images said to have been sculpted by Daedalus on temple doors at Cumae. Chapter 5 investigates why an obscure personage, Misenus, is accorded a magnificent funeral. Chapter 6 postulates Vergil himself as a third *vates*, along with Apollo and the Sibyl, and proposes metapoetic, as well as generic human, interpretations of the Golden Bough.

In conclusion, the individual scenes are set in the wider context of the poem as a whole, demonstrating how major themes are brought back into prominence and foreshadow subsequent developments. Attention is also given to structure and narrative technique. Passages of metapoetic and/or self-referential significance are highlighted in each of the five core chapters.

Table of contents

	Page
Abstract	3
Table of contents	4
List of tables	5
 1 Introduction	 6
1.1 Trends in Vergilian scholarship since 1960	8
1.2 Previous scholarship relating to the transition between <i>Aeneid</i> 5 and 6	14
1.3 Function of the Transitional Section	18
1.4 Structure of the Transitional Section	20
1.5 Direct speech as a dramatic element in the Transitional Section	26
1.6 Metapoetic and self-referential passages in the Transitional Section	28
1.7 In a nutshell	29
 2 Divine interference: crisis and (interim) resolution	 31
2.1 Attenuation of the rôles played by the gods in the <i>Aeneid</i>	34
2.2 Scholarship on the gods in the last half-century	36
2.3 The burning of the fleet	39
2.4 Aeneas and Anchises	45
2.5 Rome founded in Sicily	47
2.6 Venus and Neptune	50
2.7 Somnus and Palinurus	52
2.8 Narrative treatment	53
2.9 Conclusion	55
 3 The ‘sacrifice’ of Palinurus	 58
3.1 Sacrifice and its variants in the <i>Aeneid</i>	60
3.2 Modern views of sacrifice and scapegoat	73
3.3 The circumstances of Palinurus’ death	75
3.4 Palinurus’ death as ‘sacrifice’	80
3.5 Conclusion: Palinurus’ death reclassified	83
 4 Labyrinthine chronology in the Daedalus ekphrasis	 86
4.1 Viewers and readers	88
4.2 Contrasts with other ekphraseis in the <i>Aeneid</i>	90
4.3 The mythological past	93
4.4 The Trojan present	97
4.5 The Augustan ‘future’	103
4.6 Self-referential and metapoetic elements	106
4.7 Synthesis	109
4.8 Conclusion	112

5	Misenus Aeolides: the almost unknown warrior	115
5.1	Discovery of Misenus' body	116
5.2	Misenus and Palinurus, and links with Homer	118
5.3	The nature of Misenus' death	121
5.4	Who was Aeneas' companion Misenus?	124
5.5	Misenus as bard: metapoetic significance	129
5.6	Misenus' funeral	133
5.7	Symbolism in the funeral	139
5.8	Conclusion: the purpose and function of the Misenus episode	141
6	Vates tres: Apollo, the Sibyl, and the poet	146
6.1	Structure, time, and location	147
6.2	<i>Adsunt tres vates</i>	150
6.3	Fictitious, real, and metapoetic temples	153
6.4	Plucking the recalcitrant Bough	158
6.5	Metapoetic, and generic human symbolism of the Bough	164
6.6	Sacrifices to the chthonic gods	166
6.7	Conclusion	167
7	Conclusion: transition in context	171
7.1	Recapitulation	172
7.2	Preparation	175
7.3	Narrative and poetic technique	177
7.4	Intertextuality, and metapoetic and self-referential significance	182
7.5	Overall contribution to the poem and concluding remarks	184
	Appendix: Analysis of metrical patterns in the Daedalus ekphrasis of <i>Aeneid</i> 6	187
	Bibliography	188
A	Commentaries and ancient texts	188
B	Modern scholarship	192

List of tables

1	Book divisions in the <i>Aeneid</i>	23
2	Structure of the Transitional Section	24
3	Descriptions of components of sacrifice in the <i>Aeneid</i>	61
4	Component elements of sacrificial rites in the <i>Aeneid</i>	68
5	Similarities between Elpenor and Palinurus and Misenus	120

1. Introduction

My principal objective in this thesis is a critical examination of Vergil's treatment of the section of the *Aeneid* which carries the narrative forward from the end of the interlude represented by the commemorative games for the first anniversary of Anchises' death to the beginning of Aeneas' descent to the Underworld, spanning two books from 5.604 to 6.261. Throughout the thesis these 529 lines, which are divided almost equally between Books 5 and 6 (268 + 261 lines), will be referred to, for the sake of convenience, as the 'Transitional Section'. Here, it should also be noted immediately that a short passage from a little later in the poem (6.337-83) has also had to be included in my scope, in order to facilitate a full interpretative evaluation of the Palinurus episode which takes place within the Transitional Section, at the end of Book 5.

If, beginning from a very early date, Book 5 of the *Aeneid* has often been characterized, loosely speaking, as 'the games' and Book 6 as 'the Underworld',¹ such convenient designations take no account of the essential continuity of the Transitional Section of the text which leads the reader from the concluding high point of the games towards the major climax of the first half of the *Aeneid*. Rigid adherence to the book divisions in this way, even though they are Vergil's own, risks overlooking the powerful momentum of the narrative at this point. As will become apparent during the course of this Introduction and of my thesis as a whole, my contention is that notwithstanding the break between Books 5 and 6 the Transitional Section constitutes a coherent, composite narrative unit integral to the poem as a whole, but has not previously been addressed as such,² even though a considerable amount of scholarly attention has been devoted to some of the individual episodes, such as the burning of the ships, the loss and death of Palinurus, the Daedalus ekphrasis, and the Golden Bough.

Viewed as a single unit, this 'bridge' between games and κατάβασις is especially remarkable in a number of respects. First of all, the Transitional Section contributes significantly to the poem as a whole, since, following the extended episodes at Carthage and Drepanum, it effectively restarts the main plot through the recapitulation of

¹ Servius on 3.718: *quinto festivitatem, sexto scientiam*, in Thilo & Hagen, Vol. 1 (1878-81).

² Suerbaum (1980) and annual bibliographies published in *Vergilius*, prepared by Alexander McKay up to 2005-6 (Vol. 52), and since then by Shirley Werner, testify to the relative paucity of material concerning the latter part of Book 5 and the earlier part of Book 6; Nugent (1992), p. 275, also refers to 'the rather meagre bibliography on Book V'.

important themes and through religious and psychological preparation in anticipation of Aeneas' κατάβασις. Secondly, in terms of structure, the Transitional Section is markedly different from the extended narrative sections which precede and follow it, being constructed of a concatenation of diverse, shorter, faster-moving scenes, in which a certain number of symmetrical patterns may be perceived. Thirdly, several of the scenes stand out as a result of a more extensive use of direct speech than in the account of the games, thereby lending a quasi-dramatic character to those parts of the narrative. Fourthly, quite apart from intertextual engagement with earlier poets, a particularly notable feature is the high incidence of passages identified in which metapoetic significance may be perceived and/or in which the poet makes unmistakeable allusions to his previous work, and sometimes even may be understood to be referring to himself.

In furtherance of my objective, I have chosen to approach the Transitional Section in five 'core' chapters. The order of the chapters follows more or less the sequence of the text. A small number of modifications should, however, be noted. Firstly, as already intimated above, since the character of Palinurus is given a degree of prominence at the end of Book 5, where he is lost overboard, it is also necessary, for the sake of completeness, to include in Chapter 3 discussion of the passage later in Book 6 where Palinurus provides his own account of his misfortune (6.337-83). Secondly, discussion of the initial encounter with the Sibyl is included in Chapter 6, together with discussion of the rites and sacrifices which are carried out in the presence of the Sibyl immediately before the κατάβασις. Thirdly, discussion of the discovery of the Golden Bough, which is embedded between the two scenes relating to Misenus, has also been included in Chapter 6.

Each of the chapters raises important topics for (re)examination. All five core chapters offer new perspectives on previous scholarship and/or entirely new ideas. In Chapter 2, for example, it is shown that no one of the various views of the rôle of the gods, as put forward by a number of scholars,³ is on its own entirely satisfactory in the specific context of the Transitional Section. Conventional views of Palinurus, as a sacrifice or a scapegoat,⁴ are challenged in Chapter 3, using both ancient criteria and modern scholarship not only from the field of classics,⁵ but also from that of

³ Coleman (1982); Williams, G (1983), Chapter 2, pp. 17-39; Lyne (1987), Chapter 2, especially pp. 66-71; Feeney (1991), Chapter 4, pp. 129-87.

⁴ More than twenty scholars who have used such designations, especially Putnam (1965), Chapter 2, are cited in a footnote at the beginning of Chapter 3 concerning the so-called 'sacrifice' of Palinurus.

⁵ Burkert (1972/1983); Girard (1972/77), *idem* (1982/86); Vernant (1981); Bandera (1981).

psychology.⁶ Chapter 4 analyses three interwoven parallel chronologies in the complexity of the Daedalus ekphrasis, building upon and extending earlier scholarship.⁷ New lines of investigation are also pursued in Chapter 5, which examines the apparently neglected genealogy of Misenus and his symbolic rôle in the poem. After noting that much previous scholarship on the Sibyl has focused upon the location of her cave,⁸ and on the positioning of the Cumaean Sibyl within the context of the mythology/history of oracles around the Mediterranean and the Levant,⁹ Chapter 6 recognizes Vergil as a third *vates* alongside Apollo and the Sibyl in the early part of Book 6. In all five central chapters, I identify and discuss elements which are of general metapoetic significance or which may be taken to refer in some way to the poet himself or to his own work. Some of these have apparently not previously been noted, particularly in respect of the Golden Bough. Following these five chapters, which adopt a ‘vertical’ approach, Chapter 7 is ‘horizontal’ in perspective, looking at the ways in which the Transitional Section contributes to the poem as a whole by recalling themes from earlier in the work and foreshadowing themes from later in the work, thereby helping to bind together the ‘Odyssean’ and ‘Iliadic’ halves of the poem.

1.1 Trends in Vergilian scholarship since 1960

Amongst trends of particular relevance to this thesis which have manifested themselves during the course of the last fifty or sixty years, three stand out which may also be expected to have an enduring influence upon Vergilian scholarship.¹⁰ For convenience, these trends may be referred to with the following abbreviated terms, viz: ‘other voices’, ‘focalization’, and ‘intertextuality’. When taken together, these developments in literary criticism tend to place a greater emphasis upon the insights of individual readers/listeners,¹¹ although not necessarily to the complete exclusion of putative authorial intentions. It is not possible here to go into each of these trends at any great length, so a brief outline must suffice, highlighting, from the perspective of the present exercise, a few representative contributors. Of these trends, intertextuality is

⁶ Freud (1901/24), Freud (1913).

⁷ Fitzgerald (1984); Putnam (1998b), Chapter 4, pp. 75-96 [= *idem* (1987) = *idem* (1995c), incorporating minor revisions].

⁸ Maiuri (1932), reproduced in Maiuri (1983); Fletcher (1941/66), pp. 50-2, additional note on 1-264; McKay (1967); Schoder (1970 and 1971/2); Clark (1977a, b); McKay (1984); Galinsky (2009).

⁹ della Corte (1972); Parke (1988).

¹⁰ Harrison, S J (1990), pp. 1-20, provides a useful overview of developments from the mid-nineteenth century up to 1989.

¹¹ Unless otherwise indicated, all subsequent references to (re-)reader(s) are to be considered to refer equally to (re-)listener(s): see further discussion of readers, below.

pervasive and is perhaps the most interesting and relevant to the Transitional Section, being evident in numerous places, especially in the Daedalus ekphrasis (6.14-33: see Chapter 4), while focalization and other voices are particularly important in the boat-burning episode (5.604-99: see Chapter 2).

Other voices

Already evident in the commentary originating from the fourth-fifth centuries CE and generally referred to as Servius Auctus, or simply as Servius (discussed in 1.2, below), glorification of the Augustan settlement and the associated peace, along with the Roman empire, came to be considered by many scholars and commentators as the main ‘message’ of the *Aeneid*.¹² This interpretation held primacy for many centuries (and is not defunct),¹³ despite the irony to be found in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* and the bitter disillusionment evident in Lucan’s *De Bello Civili*, both of which were written within a hundred years of Vergil’s death, and bring out the darker side of the *Aeneid*.¹⁴ Notable manifestations of the emphasis of the *Aeneid* perceived as ‘imperialist’ are Jupiter’s promise of unending empire (1.279), the eulogy of Augustus in the parade of heroes (6.791-805), and the prominent position of Augustus on the shield forged by Vulcan, which Venus presents to Aeneas (8.678-81, 714-22).

Since the early 1960s, however, some scholars have considered the message of the *Aeneid* to be more ambiguous. ‘Other voices’, pointing out the suffering of ordinary individuals, the human cost of empire, and the military violence required to achieve and maintain peace, were brought particularly to the fore in 1963 by Adam Parry in what is generally considered to be a landmark article, followed later by other important contributions from scholars such as Ralph Johnson, Oliver Lyne and Don Fowler.¹⁵ In the wake of Parry’s interpretation, a certain polarization opposed an ‘optimistic’ view of the *Aeneid*, which focuses upon the achievement of peace, prosperity, and the glory of empire, against a ‘pessimistic’ view which gives greater emphasis to violence and brutality (the latter constituting the so-called Harvard school). Yet elements perceived as optimistic or pessimistic may be seen to coexist in the *Aeneid*, contributing to

¹² Preamble to Servius’ commentary: ‘*intentio Vergilii haec est, Homerum imitari et Augustum laudare a parentibus*’. Particularly influential works of modern scholarship include: Heinze (1915), pp. 490-1; Otis (1964), pp. 302, 390-1; Hardie (1986). Hardie (2014), p. 93, mentions factors contributing to the longevity of the ‘traditional’ view.

¹³ For a recent affirmation of Virgil as a pro-Augustan propagandist, see: Powell (2008).

¹⁴ Tarrant (1997), pp. 62, 64-5; also, Hardie (1992), pp. 60-1.

¹⁵ Parry (1963); Johnson (1976); Lyne (1987); Fowler (1990) [= Fowler (2000), pp. 40-63].

‘ambivalence, uncertainty and a plurality of voices’.¹⁶ Faced with such ambiguity readers are left to assess for themselves which side of the balance, if either, bears more weight. Readers are not, however, obliged to adopt one or other position, and may choose to recognize a more subtle and uncomfortable message in the paradox that armed force is all too often invoked in order to maintain peace and good order. Occasionally, indeed, a single episode can even appear to support both views, as with the ill-fated expedition of Nisus and Euryalus, in which their glory is initially sung by the poet (9.446-9) whilst shortly thereafter the pathos and tragic consequences of premature death are evoked by the somewhat longer and deeply moving apostrophe uttered by Euryalus’ mother to her dead son (9.481-97).

Reacting to Parry, a generation later, Charles Martindale has argued powerfully against the ‘intentionalism’ implicit in attributing ‘message’ and ‘voices’ to the author. In his view, reference to different ‘voices’ in Parry’s interpretation might reasonably be replaced by reference to different ‘readings’.¹⁷ Hence, he argues, it is readers, with the ‘baggage’ of their own educational and social pre-conditioning,¹⁸ including any previous interpretations of which they may be aware, who are responsible for reading voices into the text, whether or not the author may have consciously inserted such voices. Christine Perkell gives a useful summary of the development of these opposing interpretations, which are epitomized in differing attitudes to the killing of Turnus at the end of the poem.¹⁹ Citing Johnson’s view of the polysemous nature of the poem, however, Perkell wisely concludes: ‘there is no “correct” way to read the *Aeneid* or its crucial final scene’.²⁰

Within the Transitional Section, Anchises’ apparition alludes briefly at 5.737 to the coming glory of Aeneas’ descendants. On the other hand, the voices of the rebellious women (5.615-17) express views which represent a serious threat to the longer-term destiny of the *Aeneadae*. Other examples highlighting human suffering are Aeneas’ epigrammatic lament over the loss of Palinurus (5.870-1), and the description of Misenus’ premature death as *indigna* (6.163). As an example of an episode in which the prospect of future glory is subtly undermined elsewhere in the poem, the foundation

¹⁶ O’ Hara (2007), p. 102.

¹⁷ Martindale (1993), pp. 40-1.

¹⁸ Martindale (1993), p. 5.

¹⁹ Perkell (1999), pp. 16-22, albeit without referring to Martindale in this part of her Introduction.

²⁰ Perkell (1999), p. 22: surprisingly, she introduces this comment with ‘perhaps’; Johnson (1976), p. 20; cf. also Conte (1986), p. 160, referring to the *Aeneid*’s ‘polycentrism’; Fowler (1995), §3: ‘... free us from any belief ... that there is one way to read’; Putnam (1998b), p. 209, concerning Vergilian ekphrasis: ‘a multiplicity of interpretive perspectives’.

of Acesta is offset later by intimations of the decline of great cities (see discussion in Chapter 2.5).²¹

Focalization

The term ‘focalization’ is a refinement of ‘point of view’, which had been considered insufficiently precise by some literary critics.²² ‘Focalization’ is thus reserved specifically for the literary device in which the account of an object or scene is related as it is perceived by a particular character in the narrative, reflecting his/her own thoughts and emotional reactions. ‘Voice’ on the other hand is applied specifically to words spoken or written by a character or by a narrator (whether internal or external). A good example of focalization is Aeneas’ contemplation of and response to the images in the Temple of Juno at Carthage (1.450-93). Within the Transitional Section, on the other hand, focalization of the Daedalus ekphrasis in Book 6 is less clear-cut. Reaction to the temple doors at Cumae is more complex, for while it is the Trojans, including Aeneas, who actually see the sculpted panels (6.14-33) and show evident reluctance to be called away from them (6.33-4), the poet himself seems to suggest reactions which perhaps he himself and external viewers might experience, by inserting into the text both exclamation (6.21) and apostrophe (6.30-1).

Although ideas, themes, or opinions can, of course, be expressed directly in a text, authors may also express themselves indirectly, by relating what a character sees and his/her internal reaction, which may or may not be articulated in words uttered by the character. A description may also imply the perspective of a character through tone or vocabulary. Towards the end of the twentieth century, however, Fowler, in particular, highlighted the way in which conflicting ideas could be perceived in the *Aeneid* through what he termed ‘deviant focalization’.²³ The perspective or views of a character within a text, whether explicit or implied, need not necessarily reflect the views of the author. Hence, Fowler pointed out that focalization can be ‘deviant’ when, contrary to expectation, focalized opinion does not coincide with the presumed or expressed views of the narrator, thereby generating ambiguity and uncertainty.²⁴ A good example of such ‘deviant focalization’ in the Transitional Section is provided by the boat-burning incident, which is focalized and vocalized through the Trojan women. Even before Iris

²¹ See Hardie (1992), pp. 59-61, concerning the mutability and decay of cities.

²² Genette (1972/80), pp. 10-11, 188-90, adopted the term ‘focalization’ to avoid ambiguity in the term ‘point of view’, but as focalization *on*; Bal (1980/85), pp. 100-18, refined the concept as focalization *by/through*, differentiating between ‘who sees?’ and ‘who speaks?’.

²³ Fowler (1990) [= Fowler (2000), Chapter 2, pp. 40-63].

²⁴ Fowler (1990), pp. 42, 45 [= Fowler (2000), Chapter 2, pp. 42, 45].

stirs them to rebellious action (5.615-7), the travel-weary women are portrayed expressing a view which is heterodox in the context of the divinely established objective of the Trojan exiles. Seeking through arson to compel the Trojan men to settle in Sicily, the women represent an alternative, but viable option,²⁵ which is completely at odds with Aeneas' mission. The reader is left to respond sympathetically or not.

Intertextuality

From the earliest times, commentators have noted the way in which Vergil draws on earlier models and reworks the material to his own ends. The preamble to Servius' commentary (already cited in footnote 12, above) states: *intentio Vergilii haec est, Homerum imitari*. Hence, ancient commentators focused particularly on the concepts of *imitatio* and *aemulatio*, in comparing later authors with their predecessors.²⁶ In recent times, following the publication by Gian Biagio Conte in 1974 of a monograph in Italian, which has been recognized as 'seminal',²⁷ allusion and intertextuality were subjected to a more intensive debate, especially after the appearance of an English translation in 1986.²⁸ Towards the end of the twentieth century and into the early years of the current one, various scholars have looked more closely at Vergil's treatment of his models from a linguistic and stylistic point of view, identifying in his poetic output a much more complex, 'systematic program of allusion based on an analytical reading of major sources'.²⁹

As intimated above in discussing 'other voices', a degree of contention concerns authorial intention, which, particularly in the absence of letters or other reliable contemporary testimony, can rarely, if at all, be established with any degree of certainty. Hence, moving away from the concept of intentionality, Conte suggested that the relationship of later texts to earlier texts could be attributed to 'poetic memory' within the context of an overall 'epic code'.³⁰ In the subsequent debate, Stephen Hinds favoured a differentiation between allusion, recognizing authorial intention in some instances (but not always), and the broader concept of intertext, which embraces

²⁵ That the option is viable is demonstrated by the fact that it is implemented for a segment of the Trojan community through the foundation of Acesta (5.746-61).

²⁶ Farrell (1991), p. 6.

²⁷ Conte (1974), described as 'seminal' by Hinds (1997), p. 116.

²⁸ Conte (1986) is a translation, with some modifications, of most of the 1974 work and of most of a subsequent work (also in Italian) first published in 1980 and revised in 1984. Some of the more important contributions to the debate appeared subsequently in the journal *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, founded by Conte and others in 1978.

²⁹ Farrell (1991), p. 9.

³⁰ Conte (1986), especially pp. 27, 31, 27; the concept of epic code is well summarized by Charles Paul Segal in the 'Foreword', p. 13.

resonances of which the author may not have been aware, as well as possible connexions which a reader may introduce from his/her own experience of both literature and life more generally.³¹ Indeed, in a much wider but closely related interpretative context, Martindale had already stressed the importance of readers' own circumstances and of reception history in influencing understanding and responses to literature.³² Subsequently, Fowler and Lowell Edmunds have also placed great emphasis upon the rôle of the reader in the context of intertextuality, Fowler stating that 'the reader is figured as operating on the text to produce meaning, rather than attempting to recover authorial intention',³³ and Edmunds seeing the reader as 'the locus of intertextuality',³⁴ and concluding that 'it is impossible to distinguish between an intertext and an allusion'.³⁵

As Martindale had pointed out, therefore, despite any resonances or 'spin' which an author may have sought to introduce, the 'consumer' is always at liberty to interpret according to his/her own education, experience, opinions, or contemporary circumstances.³⁶ In this connexion, Fowler aptly observes, '*all* art depends for its interpretation on the competence of the viewer'.³⁷ This is perhaps especially true for the viewer (here, the reader) of a poem such as the *Aeneid*, which stimulates a plurality of literary recollections and other contemporary or historical parallels. Different readers or groups of readers at different times are also likely to have different reactions, and some may perceive what the author may not have intended (in so far as the author's intention can be ascertained at all). Similarly, the initial interpretation of any individual first-time reader is likely to be refined, or even completely revised, upon subsequent readings, when changed circumstances and/or knowledge of what is to come may affect the reading experience.

Following Conte, Alessandro Barchiesi and, most recently, Edan Dekel have published works upon intertextual relationships between Vergil and Homer.³⁸ Wider studies of intertextuality in Latin poetry with valuable sections on the *Aeneid* have also

³¹ Hinds (1997); Hinds (1998).

³² Martindale (1993), p. 3: '*Meaning ... is always realized at the point of reception; if so, we cannot assume that an "intention" is effectively communicated within any text.*' Martindale's italics.

³³ Fowler (1995), unpaginated, §3; cf. also Fowler (1997b) [= Fowler (2000), pp. 115-37].

³⁴ Edmunds (2001), p. 159, and Edmunds (2004), p. 160;

³⁵ Edmunds (2001), p. 164.

³⁶ An inherent risk in these views is that all interpretations, however idiosyncratic or extreme, may appear to be legitimized. Cf. Cox (1997), especially p. 335, concerning 'how it [a work of art] can be used to validate the destruction of thousands of lives'.

³⁷ Fowler (1996), p. 61 [=Fowler (2000), p. 90].

³⁸ Barchiesi (1984); Dekel (2012).

been published by Jeffrey Wills and by Hinds.³⁹ Damien Nelis on the other hand has focused upon intertextuality between the *Aeneid* and Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautika*, while Wendell Clausen has looked at relationships with both Homer and Apollonius Rhodius.⁴⁰ By way of example (to be discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.2, below), within the Transitional Section Vergil draws upon a single Odyssean character (Elpenor) to create two differentiated characters, namely Palinurus and Misenus. Moreover, the relationship between the Daedalus ekphrasis and Catullus' *Carmen* 64 exhibits a complementary intertextuality which is especially noteworthy (to be discussed in Chapter 4.3, 4.4, below).

Yelena Baraz and Christopher van den Berg have provided a useful summary of the differing views concerning intertextuality and of shared common ground, together with an extensive bibliography.⁴¹

1.2 Previous scholarship relating to the transition between *Aeneid* 5 and 6

Inevitably, given the vast amount of literature on Vergil, it has been necessary to be selective. Since the most convenient criterion for selection is publication date, I have concentrated, apart from a relatively small number of exceptions, on scholarship published during the last fifty to sixty years, that is, from the 1960s onwards. Ideas and interpretations originating from before that time are, in any case, cited frequently in scholarship published since the 1960s, whether such earlier views are then accepted and developed, or refuted. Amongst the exceptions, it is worth drawing attention immediately to the two giants of early twentieth century German scholarship, namely Richard Heinze and Eduard Norden, both of whom remain influential and are widely cited in studies on Vergil. Both scholars published the first editions of their work in 1903. Heinze's work entitled *Virgils epische Technik* ran to three editions,⁴² and its continuing value for scholarship is attested by the fact that it was translated into English as late as 1993.⁴³ Norden's commentary, *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI*, also ran to three editions.⁴⁴ Moreover, his continuing relevance is attested by reprintings in 1957

³⁹ Wills (1996); Hinds (1998).

⁴⁰ Nelis (2001); Clausen (2002).

⁴¹ Baraz & van den Berg (2013), pp. 1-3, with bibliography, pp. 133-48.

⁴² Third and final edition: Heinze (1915). Later reprints, including the so-called 'fourth edition' issued around the time of his death in 1929, are unrevised.

⁴³ Heinze (1993), translated by Hazel and David Harvey and Fred Robertson. A reprint appeared in 1999, augmented by an Index of citations.

⁴⁴ Third and final edition: Norden (1927). Norden died in 1941. The 'fourth edition' of 1957 is a reprint.

and again in 1970, as well as by Nicholas Horsfall's tribute to him as an 'eagle amongst garden birds'.⁴⁵ Both Heinze and Norden are extremely thorough in their analyses.

Concerning the text, notwithstanding the more recent appearances of Conte's Teubner edition, and the Spanish edition of Luis Rivero García, for convenience and ease of availability Sir Roger Mynors' *Oxford Classical Text (OCT)*, published in 1969, has been adopted as the established text for the purpose of this thesis.⁴⁶ Commentaries which have appeared in the last half-century or so include Deryck Williams' commentary on Book 5 and his two-volume work covering the whole of the *Aeneid*.⁴⁷ A corrected reprint of Sir Frank Fletcher's 1941 commentary on Book 6 was issued posthumously in 1966, followed during the next decade and from the same publishing house by Roland Austin's commentary on the same book.⁴⁸ Rivero García's 2009-11 four-volume Spanish edition of the text also contains a commentary. Most recently, however, Horsfall has published a substantial two-volume commentary on Book 6 which runs to more than nine hundred pages.⁴⁹ As regards earlier commentaries other than Norden, two nineteenth-century works occasionally offer views of some interest, namely John Conington's commentary as revised by Henry Nettleship, reprinted as recently as 2008, and the third volume of James Henry's *Aeneidea*, which covers Books 5-9.⁵⁰

To the extent that texts have survived, the ancient commentary tradition can also offer valuable insights from periods closer to Vergil's time. Of these, the most notable is the early fifth-century commentary of Maurus Servius Honoratus, possibly drawing upon a longer, now lost commentary dating from the fourth century generally thought to have been compiled by Aelius Donatus.⁵¹ An expanded version of Servius' commentary believed to incorporate material from the earlier commentary was published in the early seventeenth century by Pierre Daniel. Accordingly, the

⁴⁵ Horsfall (2013), Vol. 1, p. xxvii; see also Vol. 2, Appendix 3, pp. 645-54: 'In the shadow of Eduard Norden'.

⁴⁶ Conte (2009); Rivero García (2009-11). Mynors (1969). Following Perrell (1999), p. 28, however, I have used *v* in place of Mynors' consonantal *u*. See also, Liberman (2012) for a lukewarm review of Conte's Teubner edition.

⁴⁷ Respectively: Williams, R D (1960) and (1972-3).

⁴⁸ Fletcher (1941/66); Austin (1977); previously Austin had published a commentary on Book 4 (1955).

⁴⁹ Horsfall (2013), reviewed by Casali (2014) and Giusti (2015); previously, Horsfall had produced commentaries on Books 2 (2008), 3 (2006), 7 (1999/2000), and 11 (2003), which are also occasionally referred to in later chapters.

⁵⁰ Conington/Nettleship (1884); Henry (1889).

⁵¹ Fowler (1997a), p. 73; Murgia (2004), p. 1 of hand-out: 'Definitions', following p. 8 of text.

augmented work is commonly referred to as Servius Auctus or Servius Danielis.⁵² Mostly, the nineteenth-century Thilo and Hagen edition of Servius has to be relied on,⁵³ since the so-called ‘Harvard edition’ sponsored by the American Philological Association (now the Society for Classical Studies), which aims to present separately the texts of Servius and Servius Auctus, remains incomplete, having so far reached only Book 5.⁵⁴ The *Saturnalia* of Macrobius Ambrosius Theodosius, also dating from the early fifth-century and in which the young Servius features as a character, is another useful source of ancient comment.⁵⁵

Approaches to the study of Vergil’s *Aeneid* most often, quite understandably, respect the book divisions of the poem which, unlike those of the Homeric epics, are Vergil’s own. Monographs which look at particular aspects or themes spanning several or all of the books of the *Aeneid* also tend to adhere to the book divisions of the poem. Book-orientated approaches are, of course, entirely valid, but while attention has sometimes been given to the way in which the narrative progresses from one book to the next,⁵⁶ most such approaches do not take account of the full implications, in terms of continuity, of the lack of any appreciable pause between Books 5 and 6, which represents scarcely even a caesura in the Transitional Section (see discussion in 1.4, below). In consequence, it has been necessary to examine numerous works which focus on the poem in terms of its successive books in order to seek out sections which contribute to a full analysis of the Transitional Section. Some of these contributions are mentioned briefly below in order of publication. For example, Brooks Otis discusses poetic aspects of the poem, book by book.⁵⁷ Similarly, Chris Mackie approaches the characterization of Aeneas along book-orientated lines.⁵⁸ Again, Nelis follows a similar methodology when relating the *Aeneid* to Apollonius Rhodius’ *Argonautika*.⁵⁹ Clausen also progresses through the poem in his work which focuses, *inter alia*, on allusion.⁶⁰ In most of these works, however, little if any space is given to the transition from Book 5 to Book 6.⁶¹

⁵² It is not necessary, for the purposes of this thesis, to differentiate between fourth and fifth century commentary. Accordingly, reference to ‘Servius’ throughout will be to the expanded text of Servius Auctus.

⁵³ Thilo & Hagen (1878-1902).

⁵⁴ Rand, *et al.* (1946): Books 1-2; Stocker, *et al.* (1965): Books 3-5.

⁵⁵ Kaster (2011).

⁵⁶ Quinn (1968), p. 65; Harrison, E L (1980).

⁵⁷ Otis (1964).

⁵⁸ Mackie (1988).

⁵⁹ Nelis (2001).

⁶⁰ Clausen (2002).

⁶¹ Exceptions (discussed below) are Barchiesi (1979); Kyriakidis (1998).

Noteworthy contributions relating to a single book are Michael Putnam's chapter on Book 5 in his monograph which analyses four of the books of the *Aeneid*, and Williams' article on Book 6. Recognizing that Book 5 is 'frequently treated in cursory fashion' (p. 64), Putnam focuses on the contrast between the games and reality, seeing 'sacrifice through suffering' as the book's unifying theme (p. 65).⁶² Since he applies the designation of 'sacrifice' to Palinurus' death, his interpretation is especially important for my Chapter 3, on Palinurus, where I argue nevertheless, on the basis of theories concerning sacrifice put forward by classical scholars as well as by Sigmund Freud,⁶³ that sacrifice is not an entirely appropriate descriptor for this death. Williams, on the other hand, discusses mainly the subject of human suffering and how Vergil attempts to find a solution to this problem in his exposition of life after death in the later part of Book 6.⁶⁴ In consequence, he devotes no more than seven lines of his article (p. 50) to the first 261 lines of the book, which are of central interest for this thesis. Giusto Monaco's work offers a fairly straightforward 'walk' through Book 5, but with a few interesting observations on the burning of the ships and the loss of Palinurus.⁶⁵

Several monographs which adopt a thematic approach or a wider literary perspective, or which deal with aspects of life during the late Republic and early Principate also have sections relevant to the *Aeneid*. Thus, Philip Hardie's works on imperium and on post-Vergilian epic discuss aspects of the *Aeneid* which have a bearing on the subject of this thesis.⁶⁶ On religion, John Scheid's work is invaluable, as is the two-volume work by Mary Beard, John North and Simon Price.⁶⁷ The chapter on Vergil in David Quint's comparative study ranging from Vergil to Milton also offers helpful insights, particularly in relation to the metamorphosis of Aeneas from individual warrior to Roman general (p. 91) and the suppression of his individual will required by Fate (p. 83).⁶⁸

In order to understand Vergil's treatment of the end of Book 5 and the beginning of Book 6, it is necessary, as already intimated, to have recourse to numerous briefer contributions, such as journal articles and chapters in works aiming to span a wide range of perspectives on the whole of Vergil's output. Two encyclopaedias are helpful in

⁶² Putnam (1965), Chapter 2, pp. 64-104, with notes, pp. 211-19.

⁶³ Burkert (1972/1983); Girard (1972/77), *idem* (1982/86); Vernant (1981); Bandera (1981). Also: Freud (1901/24), Freud (1913).

⁶⁴ Williams, R D (1964), particularly, p. 48: 'It is in the later part of Book vi that Virgil comes nearest to a solution of the problem of human suffering'. Reprinted in Harrison, S J (1990), Chapter 9, pp. 191-207.

⁶⁵ Monaco (1972).

⁶⁶ Hardie (1986, 1993).

⁶⁷ Scheid (1998, 2003); Beard, *et al.* (1998), especially Volume 2, Chapter 6, 'Sacrifices', pp. 148-65.

⁶⁸ Quint (1993), Chapter 2, 'Repetition and ideology in the *Aeneid*', pp. 50-96, with notes, pp. 380-1.

providing initial overviews of topics with bibliography for follow-up. In particular, for important individual topics relevant to the present research the six-volume Italian *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* has been a useful source (for example, entries on *Palinuro*, *Miseno*, *Sacrificium*).⁶⁹ Unfortunately, *The Virgil encyclopedia*, more recently published in only three volumes by Wiley-Blackwell, has proved less helpful for the present task, with generally shorter articles and less extensive and not always more up-to-date bibliographies.⁷⁰ Compendious volumes, often described as ‘companions’ or similar, however, have proved valuable for providing an overview of debate, as well as helpful bibliography. Of particular note are Horsfall’s Brill companion, Martindale’s Cambridge companion, and most recently Joseph Farrell and Michael Putnam’s Wiley-Blackwell companion.⁷¹ Also useful are collections of previously published articles, including Stephen Harrison’s in the series ‘Oxford readings in classical studies’, and Hardie’s four-volume collection of ‘critical assessments’.⁷²

As intimated at the beginning of this section, the work of only a handful of scholarly authors is cited fairly often and in more than one chapter of this thesis. Of these, most are commentaries: Servius, Norden, Williams, Horsfall. Aside from these, I also refer on several occasions for a variety of reasons to sections of the works of Heinze, Otis, Putnam, Fowler, Lyne, Hardie, and again Horsfall, as well as to the *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*. No one of these, however, has paid specific attention to the Transitional Section between the games and the Underworld.

1.3 Function of the Transitional Section

As I shall argue at greater length in the concluding chapter, the function of the Transitional Section is essentially twofold, and may be summed up in the words ‘recapitulation’ and ‘preparation’, with thematic strands which extend backwards and forwards throughout the text. In this way, the Transitional Section contributes to the poem as a whole, being an integral part of the progression from Troy to Lavinium, and providing a necessary return to the main plot with a corresponding modulation of mood.

A degree of symmetry, albeit not perfect, may be perceived here around the ‘fulcrum’ of the Daedalus ekphrasis, which weaves Roman heritage into a chronological nexus, linking remote past and the fictitious present with the Augustan ‘future’, in

⁶⁹ Cozzoli, *et al.* (1984-91).

⁷⁰ Thomas & Ziolkowski (2014); for divergent reviews, see Goldberg (2014) and Holzberg (2014).

⁷¹ Horsfall (1995); Martindale (1997); Farrell & Putnam (2010).

⁷² Harrison, S J (1990); Hardie (1999).

anticipation of the ‘future-in-the-past’ revelations which will be made in the Underworld. Generally speaking, most of the scenes before the ekphrasis look back, reminding readers of themes from earlier in the poem (which will continue to be important later in the poem), while scenes after the ekphrasis mostly provide religious and mystic preparation for what is to come not only for readers, but also for the Trojans, especially Aeneas.

Recapitulation is triggered by the interference of Juno, the first mention of an Olympian god for the equivalent of a whole book,⁷³ a section of the poem which covers the latter part of the sojourn at Carthage and the whole of the commemorative games. During that period, too, no progress is made towards the stated objective of settling in Hesperia/Ausonia. Juno’s intervention in the first scene of the Transitional Section, therefore, has the effect of bringing the main action of the *Aeneid* back on course, so to speak. Her action serves to remind readers not only of her implacable opposition to Trojan resettlement, but also to recall readers’ attention to the importance of Aeneas’ mission. Other important themes which the reader needs to have in mind as the principal plot resumes are recalled by subsequent events. Through the rebellious action of the women, the human suffering endured in travelling from Troy is also brought back to the fore. Death as well as suffering is represented through the presumed death of Palinurus, the first human fatality since the suicide of Dido.

Renewal of the main plot also brings further character development. Aeneas’ crisis of confidence is overcome with supernatural help, but his recovery constitutes an important step in his metamorphosis from Trojan warrior to Roman general, a step which is immediately reinforced by the *ktisis* scene in which Acesta also stands for later Roman foundations. At much the same time, the reader is reminded of the importance of father-son relationships and, especially, of the leadership succession when Ascanius, too, makes a quantum leap towards manhood during the boat-burning episode.

Preparation for Aeneas’ descent to the Underworld commences when the theme of death is again reasserted through the discovery on the beach of Misenus’ corpse, which creates pollution and the consequent need for ritual purification. Associated with mortality, religious activities including prayers, libations, foundation rites, and a magnificent funeral, accompany the return of putative supernatural influences and the advent of the Sibyl. Moreover, the air of mysticism which is generated through the episode of the Golden Bough and through intimations of Eleusinian and

⁷³ 738 lines (4.571-5.603).

Pythagorean/Orphic cult is a harbinger of the explanation of metempsychosis to be undertaken by Anchises. Ceremonial activities pervade the poem, but, as Aeneas is prepared for his journey to the Underworld, they are especially important here by way of purification, not only to cleanse away the pollution occasioned by Misenus' dead body, but symbolically for all previous misdeeds, especially the undue delay at Carthage.

Overall, the themes which are brought back to prominence in the effectively unbroken transition in the narrative from Book 5 to Book 6 are presented within a structure which has unmistakable elements of drama (as will be discussed in Section 1.5, below), and which contrasts in mode of presentation with the extended accounts both of the games which precede the Transitional Section and of the journey through the Underworld which follows. Recapitulation of themes, progression of the plot, continued psychological metamorphosis of the principal character, dialogues between gods and between Aeneas and the Sibyl, as well as sudden death and religious ritual, all take place within a concatenation of twelve diverse and mostly short scenes (see 1.4, below), which are threaded together in quick succession within the span of 529 lines. These scenes, the longest of which runs to 122½ lines,⁷⁴ bring the Trojans to Latium and establish the atmosphere for Aeneas' descent into the Underworld, providing readers with a thorough and dramatic preparation for the imminent climax of the first half of the *Aeneid*.

1.4 Structure of the Transitional Section

From a structural perspective, the Transitional Section exhibits a number of interesting features, including (a) both balance and contrast *vis-à-vis* the preceding and following sections of narrative, (b) continuity across the two books, (c) division into multiple scenes, (d) elements of symmetry, and (e) complex chronology. Additionally, as will be discussed later in this Introduction (1.5), elements of drama may be perceived in the use of direct speech in the Transitional Section, which is markedly different from the way it is used in the preceding and following sections.

Both balance and contrast may be seen in the relationship of the Transitional Section with the two extended episodes which precede and follow it. As already mentioned, the Transitional Section is itself fairly evenly balanced between Book 5 (268

⁷⁴ Or, more precisely, 122⁵/₁₂, according to the methodology adopted by Highet (1972), pp. 18-19.

lines) and Book 6 (261 lines).⁷⁵ Viewed as a single compound unit, however, it also displays an approximate quantitative balance with the preceding and following sections of narrative. With a total of 529 lines, it is of similar length to the description of the games,⁷⁶ while not substantially shorter than the more important account of the journey through the Underworld which it heralds.⁷⁷ By way of contrast, however, in comparison with the narratives of the games and the Underworld, each of which is in its own way fairly homogeneous, the Transitional Section is constructed of a series of several diverse scenes (see below) which cohere through the functions they perform (as discussed in 1.3, above). Moreover, the Transitional Section is unique, in that no other section linking two major episodes within the poem is as long or as complex. For readers, this change of narrative style provides a much ‘bumpier ride’ after the fairly ‘smooth’ transit through the account of the games. Experiencing this change, especially after the abrupt announcement of 5.604, readers are likely to become more alert to the recapitulation and preparation being presented to them, and conscious of an increase in narrative pace. This contrast will be even more apparent if/when readers look back after the subsequent passage through the Underworld.

Continuity, with no more than at most a ‘soft break’, so to speak, between Book 5 and Book 6 is an important structural feature of the Transitional Section. Between these two books, no change takes place in time, and no break occurs in the narrative thread, for immediately following the sea voyage from Drepanum, during which Palinurus is lost, the Trojans arrive safely at Cumae and are portrayed in a short scene foraging around the environs of the shore. Location also remains unchanged, since at the very beginning of Book 6 the fleet is still at sea, and does not reach the shore of Latium until the second line of the book. Moreover, the opening words, *sic fatur lacrimans*, beg the questions ‘What did he say?’ and ‘Why is he weeping?’, so that the opening of Book 6 is wholly dependent on the end of Book 5 for its sense.

It should be mentioned here that some controversy surrounded the division between Books 5 and 6 in antiquity, since Servius states that Plotius Tucca and Lucius Varius Rufus, as Vergil’s literary executors, transferred to the beginning of Book 6 the two lines commencing *sic fatur lacrimans*, which (according to Servius) Vergil had

⁷⁵ A case could possibly be made for extending the Transitional Section to 6.263 or even 6.267, to include the invocation to the chthonic gods, thereby making the balance between the two books even more marked.

⁷⁶ Excluding the rites at Anchises’ shrine, the description of the games ‘proper’ occupies 500 lines (6.104-603); if the rites are included the number of lines is 562 (6.42-603).

⁷⁷ Excluding the invocation to the chthonic gods, the description of the transit through the Underworld occupies 631 lines (6.268-898); with the invocation, the total is 637 lines (6.262-898).

placed at the end of Book 5.⁷⁸ Whether or not this story is well-founded, if another story is true, namely that Vergil read Books 2, 4, and 6 to the imperial family shortly after the death of Augustus' nephew and son-in-law, Marcus Claudius Marcellus in late 23 BCE,⁷⁹ then Book 6 at that time would probably have had to begin with what is now line 3 (*obvertunt pelago proras*), since the reason for Aeneas' lament in what are now the first two lines would not be apparent.⁸⁰ Where reasons are given for supporting the transfer of lines, commentators cite *inter alia* the syntactical pattern represented by demonstrative adverb followed by a verb of speaking, which echoes the openings of Book 7 of the *Iliad* and Book 13 of the *Odyssey*. The two lines in question also reproduce almost exactly *Iliad* 1.357.⁸¹ Even were lines 6.1-2 transferred back to the end of Book 5, however, the opening of Book 6 with *obvertunt pelago proras* would still be closely tied to Book 5, which would then end *Cumarum adlabitur oris*. All things considered, however, the argument in favour of the emendation alleged to have been made by Tucca and Varius, is very strong. In the *OCT*, in fact, Book 6 does commence *sic fatur lacrimans*,⁸² as is the case in other modern editions before and after the *OCT*.⁸³

Accepting this emendation, Barchiesi and Stratis Kyriakidis have both drawn attention to the absence of what may conveniently be termed a 'hard stop' at the end of Book 5 and the way in which lines 6.1-2 tie the ending of Book 5 strongly to the beginning of Book 6.⁸⁴ They also note a similarity with the division between Books 6 and 7, where the new book commences immediately with an apostrophe to Aeneas' recently deceased nurse (*tu quoque ... | ... Caieta*, 7.1-2). Here, the personal name Caieta in 7.2 links back to the name of the port of Caieta (modern-day Gaeta, in the Italian region of Lazio) in the penultimate line of Book 6 (6.900), while the invocation to the Muse Erato for the second half of the poem, which might have been expected at the beginning of the book, is delayed until 7.37. A further similarity is that the presumed death of Palinurus and the death of Caieta are also both lamented epigrammatically and both, like Misenus, give their names to the places where they are

⁷⁸ Servius on 5.871.

⁷⁹ Brugnoli & Stok (1997), p. 32 (*Vita Donatiana e vita Suetoniana desumpta*, §32), pp. 97-8 (*Vita quae Donati aucti dicitur*, §46).

⁸⁰ This could perhaps have been the reason underlying Servius' comment.

⁸¹ ὡς φάτο δάκρυ χέων.

⁸² Mynors (1969), p. 226, note on 5.871.

⁸³ Conington/Nettleship (1884), p. 422; Norden (1927), p. 110; Fletcher (1941/66); Williams, R D (1960), pp. xxvi, 210; Williams, R D (1972), p. 460; Austin (1977), p. 30; Conte (2009), p. 159; Rivero García (2009-11), Vol. 2, pp. 119, 122.

⁸⁴ Barchiesi (1979); Kyriakidis (1998).

buried.⁸⁵ In consequence, Kyriakidis has referred to the end of Book 5 and the beginning of Book 7 as the ‘frame’ of the critically important Book 6 in which the future glory of Rome is to be disclosed to Aeneas.

In order to establish the uniqueness of the transition from Book 5 to Book 6, however, contrasts with other book divisions are worth noting (see Table 1, below).⁸⁶

Table 1: Book divisions in the <i>Aeneid</i>: principal changes in location, time, characters, and action			
End of previous Book		Beginning of next Book	
1	Dido’s palace; Carthaginians and Trojans feasting.	2	Aeneas begins his account (Troy).
2	Same location, time, action, characters.	3	Pause with change of subject: Aeneas’ account of the Trojans’ wanderings.
3	Same location, time, action, characters.	4	Dido, afflicted by love, addressing Anna.
4	Death of Dido in Carthage.	5	Trojans sailing away.
5	At sea; Palinurus goes overboard; Aeneas laments the loss.	6	No pause; still at sea.
6	Trojans beach ships at Caieta.	7	Slight pause; apostrophe to Caieta.
7	Near the Tiber; list of armies concludes with Camilla.	8	Laurentum; Turnus.
8	Caere; Venus gives shield to Aeneas.	9	Pilumnus’ grove; Iris encourages Turnus to attack.
9	Trojan camp; Turnus under pressure from Trojans.	10	Olympus; council of the gods.
10	Battlefield; Aeneas kills Mezentius.	11	After the battle; Aeneas sets up trophy on mound.
11	Aeneas pitches camp before Laurentum.	12	Within Laurentum, Turnus and Latinus talk.

Between the earlier books of the poem (up to and including the transition from Book 4 to Book 5), transitions occur fairly smoothly, but observe natural pauses or breaks in the action. In the second half of the poem (including the transition from Book 7 to Book 8 and all subsequent transitions), transitions are marked by a change of location, and/or characters, and/or time. Between Books 5 and 6 and Books 6 and 7, however, the transitions have such a clear continuity of time, place, characters, and action, that each of these two transitions from one book to the next can reasonably be compared with an enjambment from one line to the next. The books in the middle of the poem surrounding the visit to the Underworld are thus more tightly integrated. Yet

⁸⁵ For discussions of these epigrams: Barchiesi (1979); Kyriakidis (1998), p. 41; Dinter (2005), p. 155-6, 158.

⁸⁶ Cf. Quinn (1968), p. 65. Harrison, E L (1980) makes valuable observations on the links connecting all of the books of the *Aeneid*, but, like Quinn, he does not fully bring out the uniqueness of the transition from Book 5 to Book 6, as argued below.

despite the evident similarities in the two sides of Kyriakidis' 'frame', between Books 6 and 7 there is an appreciable pause in port, albeit brief. When Book 7 opens, the journey is already over and the ships are stationary on the shore. Moreover the sense of the opening line is not wholly dependent upon the closing words of Book 6, since the identity of the person addressed as *Tu quoque* is explained immediately in the same line (*Aeneia nutrix*, 7.1). Thus, the division between Books 5 and 6 is marked as unique.

Division into a concatenated series of twelve very diverse 'scenes' is a further unique characteristic of the Transitional Section. As shown in Table 2, below, the scenes are divided almost equally (five and seven) between the two books, while the numbers of lines are also fairly evenly divided.

Table 2: Structure of the Transitional Section between the games and the Underworld				
	Book 5			
	From	To		
1	604	699	Burning of the boats	96
2	700	745	Aeneas' crisis	46
3	746	778	Foundation of Segesta	33
4	779	826	Venus and Neptune	48
5	827	871	Voyage from Drepanum and loss of Palinurus	45
	Total: Book 5			268
	Book 6			
	1	2	Arrival at Cumae	2
6	3	13	Foraging while Aeneas goes to find the Sibyl	11
7	14	33	Daedalus and Icarus ekphrasis	19½
8	33	155	Encounter with the Sibyl	122½
9	156	184	Discovery of Misenus and funeral preparations	29
10	185	211	Golden bough	27
11	212	235	Funeral of Misenus	24
12	236	261	Rites and sacrifices prior to descent	26
	Total: Book 6			261
	Overall total			529

Although some of the scenes can be subdivided further, and although alternative segmentations of the Transitional Section may be possible, this structural break-down does not conflict with, and is sometimes finer than, the major segments into which

various commentaries and other analytical works divide the text below book level.⁸⁷ While it might have been tempting to see some significance in the number twelve, it has to be borne in mind that this segmentation is postulated for convenience in examining the Transitional Section as a whole. For example, a different view as to how to approach the end of Book 5 and the beginning of Book 6 might result in eleven scenes (amalgamating 6.3-13 with 5.827-6.2) or thirteen scenes (viewing 5.862-6.2 as a separate scene). Whether or not the number of scenes intervening between the games and the κατάβασις is twelve, however, the Transitional Section is unique within the poem in that no other example is to be found of a complex concatenation of multiple scenes linking two important extended episodes.

Elements of symmetry are also worthy of note in the Transitional Section. Close to the middle, the Daedalus ekphrasis with its complex intertwining of chronology divides six scenes which mainly recapitulate themes established earlier in the poem from five scenes which look ahead and prepare for Aeneas' entry into the Underworld. Moreover the scenes which follow the ekphrasis themselves exhibit a symmetrical nesting centred upon the discovery of the Golden Bough. The discovery is enclosed by the two scenes which relate first the death and subsequently the funeral of Misenus. These scenes are in turn enclosed by scenes featuring Aeneas with the Sibyl. This nesting serves to concentrate attention on the central scene, thereby emphasizing the critical importance of the Golden Bough as the talisman which facilitates the journey into and out of the Underworld in the rest of Book 6.

Complex chronology, as intimated in the preceding paragraph, is a final structural feature which calls for brief comment. On the basis of Jupiter's pronouncement to Venus at 1.265-77, Vergil places the principal action of the *Aeneid* close to the end of the twelfth century BCE.⁸⁸ For the present purpose, there is no reason not to accept this, since the precise dating of the fall of Troy has no bearing upon the literary analysis of the poem.⁸⁹ Alongside the fictitious Trojan present, however, at various points throughout the poem there are resonances, in the form of creatures or stories, of earlier mythological times, as well as reflections of the Augustan age. This tripartite

⁸⁷ Compatible, if not always identical, break-downs may be found in: Norden (1927); Otis (1964), pp. 271 (Book 5), 282 (Book 6); Quinn (1968), pp. 150 (Book 5), 160-1 (Book 6); Williams, R D (1972-3); Horsfall (2013) does not always have section headings, but does not offer an alternative segmentation.

⁸⁸ Taking the foundation of Rome as 753 BCE, adding 3 plus 30 plus 300 (1.265-74) gives 1086 BCE. At least a further 20 or 30 years can be added, since Jupiter refers to the birth of the twins Romulus and Remus rather than to the foundation of the city, thus locating the date of the principal action of the *Aeneid* around 1116-06, and thus the fall of Troy some seven or eight years earlier, around 1124-14.

⁸⁹ Modern scholarship dates the fall of Troy to c. 1190-80 (assuming the identification with Troy VIIa to be correct). Cf. Williams, R D (1972), p. 180, note to 1.269.

chronological structure runs throughout the poem, but is especially important when all three strands are woven together symbolically in the complex Daedalus ekphrasis discussed in Chapter 4.

Concluding this overview of structure, it is apparent that, within the span of 529 lines, the concatenation of several diverse and mostly short scenes contributes importantly to the development and progression of the poem. In combination, noteworthy structural features underline the unity and integrity of the scenes both within the Transitional Section and within the poem as a whole.

1.5 Direct speech as a dramatic element in the Transitional Section

In overall construction, as well as in some of the individual episodes, the Transitional Section exhibits features which are in character essentially ‘dramatic’, although not in a way which conforms to the precepts of Aristotle or to the narrower definition of later ‘classical’ drama, as summed up in just two lines by Boileau.⁹⁰ As demonstrated in the preceding section, a series of diverse and relatively short ‘scenes’ carries the narrative from the abrupt conclusion of the games to the beginning of the most important, climactic episode of the first half of the *Aeneid*. During these short scenes, the principal action of the poem is taken forward and character is developed to a considerable extent through interaction, sometimes conflict, between various individuals using the medium of speech. Suspense, shock and spectacle, along with the swift progression of the scenes, accentuate the dramatic nature of the transition, imparting impetus to the resumption of the main action of the *Aeneid*. In consequence, most readers will sense the effect of the accelerated pace and experience a heightened expectation of what is to come in the climax of the first half of the poem. At the same time, these dramatic scenes in quick succession both recall themes which were no more than in the background while the Trojans were relaxing during the games, and foreshadow themes and events which are to follow in the second half of the poem.

Structure and narrative treatment in the Transitional Section also contrast strongly with the sections of the poem which precede and follow it. Although the games can be subdivided according to individual competitions, the text from 5.42 to 5.603 provides a continuous account of an extended communal event, with roughly half as much direct speech as in the Transitional Section (see Chapter 2.8). On the other hand, although

⁹⁰ Aristotle, *Περὶ ποιητικῆς*, 1449b, 1450b, 1453a, 1459a, 1459b; Boileau, *Art poétique*, 3.45-6 : ‘Qu’ en un lieu, qu’ en un jour, un seul fait accompli | tient jusque’ à la fin le théâtre rempli’.

subdivisible according to the geography of the Underworld, the text from 6.262 to 6.898 offers an unbroken description of one man's personal experience of the Underworld. Here, although the incidence of direct speech is even greater, it is not dramatic in nature so much as didactic and philosophic. Initially, speech in the Underworld takes the form of questions from Aeneas, answered by his guide or other interlocutors, then takes the form of Anchises' explanations. Hence, over the course of two books, two extended narrative sections, each located in or progressing through a single location, each featuring its own principal character(s), and each characterized by its own mood, enclose a faster-moving, more varied section which has elements of drama. With its different style of presentation this transition is extremely effective in preparing the reader for Aeneas' descent to the Underworld and in helping to bridge and bind together the two halves of the poem.

Particularly noteworthy in this connexion is the scene in which Aeneas first encounters the Sibyl (6.33-155). Here, Aeneas is seen in an entirely different light from most other parts of the poem. As Denis Feeney and Susanna Morton Braund have pointed out, Aeneas is generally speaking marked by his 'taciturnity'.⁹¹ More often than not, as an aloof commander, he issues brief orders or exhorts his men, uttering prayers on occasion for the benefit of his followers, rarely engaging in dialogue, and rarely expecting an answer.⁹² With the Sibyl, however, Aeneas has to set aside this taciturnity. Needing the co-operation of the Sibyl, he is obliged to change into 'diplomatic mode' with two speeches of exactly equal length, the first demonstrating his piety, making vows in favour of Apollo and the Sibyl (5.56-76), the second arguing his case for the Sibyl to facilitate a visit to his father (5.103-23). In these speeches, Aeneas displays a degree of persuasive eloquence paralleled elsewhere only in his long speech to Evander (25 lines: 8.127-51), where again he is seeking co-operation (in this instance in the form of military aid), describing himself aptly and uncharacteristically as a suppliant (8.145).

Vergil's dramatic treatment of episodes in the *Aeneid* was in fact noted early in the twentieth century by Heinze, but has not been discussed specifically in relation to the Transitional Section of the poem.⁹³ Kenneth Quinn also used the term 'dramatic' in

⁹¹ Feeney (1983); Braund (1998).

⁹² Highet (1972), pp. 29-43, especially p. 36: 'Aeneas gives orders. He states his position. He prays; and in battle he challenges and threatens, although briefly'.

⁹³ Heinze (1915), pp. 321-3: 'so findet man ... die ganze *Aeneis* hindurch Szenen, die mit dem Auge des dramatischen Dichters gesehen ... sind' (p. 323); p. 470: 'Die *Aeneis* ist für den dramatischen Stil der

referring to Vergil's technique, whilst pointing out that the word needs qualification when used about a work not specifically designed for stage presentation.⁹⁴ Reacting against this view, however, Conte has vigorously denied the dramatic nature of the poem. His justification that no dialectical solution emerges, nor is possible owing to the supremacy of Fate, however, depends on an unhelpfully narrow definition of drama.⁹⁵ The requirement for drama to have a dialectical solution must be open to question. For example, in his analysis, Conte does not consider the theatre of the absurd nor other modern dramatic manifestations. Nevertheless, even he concedes that there is 'an illusion of dramatic form'.⁹⁶ Worth noting in this connexion, too, is that dramatization of some of Vergil's work may well have begun during his own life-time.⁹⁷ Moreover, it is also likely that as an author he could have been influenced to some extent by the representation of mythological subjects and historical themes in Roman popular performance culture,⁹⁸ as well as, particularly, by his knowledge of Greek drama.⁹⁹

Acknowledging, however, that elements of dramatic style are not sustained throughout Vergil's extended and varied epic narrative, as by definition they are in the theatrical genres of tragedy and comedy, I have chosen to refer in the rest of this thesis to scenes in the Transitional Section which are marked by such elements as being quasi-dramatic.¹⁰⁰

1.6 Metapoetic and self-referential passages in the Transitional Section

As mentioned at the beginning of this Introduction, the Transitional Section is remarkable for a high incidence of passages which support a metapoetic interpretation and/or which refer to Vergil's earlier poetry, or which may even be interpreted as pointing to the poet himself. Such passages are identified and discussed in each of the

poetischen Erzählung Jahrhunderte hindurch das Muster gewesen'; similarly, Heinze (1930), p.149, 151; Clausen (2002), p. 30, concerning the three major ekphraseis of the *Aeneid*.

⁹⁴ Quinn (1968), pp. 74-5.

⁹⁵ Conte (1986), pp. 158-71.

⁹⁶ Conte (1986), p. 162; also, Conte (1999), pp. 36, 38.

⁹⁷ Servius, note to *Eclogue* 6.11, refers to a recital of this poem at which Cicero was said to have been present. While accepting the likelihood of such performances during Vergil's life-time, Panayotakis (2008), p. 191, points out that there is some question over the date, since it is unlikely that Cicero, who died in 43 BCE, could have been present given that the *Eclogues* are thought to have been composed between 42 and 38 (Clausen (1977), pp. 15-16).

⁹⁸ Although not making any reference to Vergil, Wiseman (1998) makes clear the wide variety of forms of drama on the Roman stage during the late Republic and early Principate. Panayotakis (2008), especially p. 190: 'Theatre seems to have been in Virgil's mind when he composed the dramatic tale of Dido'.

⁹⁹ Hardie (1997).

¹⁰⁰ Quinn (1968), p. 74, uses the expressions 'essentially dramatic' and 'dramatic in spirit'.

five chapters. Symbols which bear a general metapoetic interpretation vary, as with city construction in the cases of Acesta (against a broader background of several less fortunate non-Roman cities encountered elsewhere in the narrative), as with the flagship of Aeneas' fleet following the loss of Palinurus, and as with the ancient wood where the Trojans seek wood for Misenus' pyre, which may be taken as representing the corpus of earlier poetry as well as more specifically Ennius. Above all, and apparently not previously noted, the quest for the Golden Bough stands as a metaphor for striving after the poet's laurel crown, as well as for human aspirations for achievement in general.

In most cases where metapoetic significance can be perceived, it is not difficult for the reader to transfer the meaning from the general to the particular, that is, to Vergil himself. Hence, it is almost impossible not to think of Vergil in the Daedalus ekphrasis, which concerns itself with the creation of a large-scale work of art, and especially with the anguish suffered when an exceptionally tragic subject touches an artist or poet personally. On a number of occasions, however, Vergil is almost explicit in making self-referential allusion. In the Misenus episode he associates himself, albeit indirectly, with the deceased trumpeter through a distant genealogical link with Cretheus, a friend of the Muses (9.775: *Musarum comitem*) who is said to have sung of the arms of men (9.777: *arma virum*). Clearest of all, however, is the episode early in Book 6 in which Aeneas vows a temple to Apollo, mirroring the poet's own vow, at the beginning of the third book of the *Georgics*, to build a metaphorical temple which is usually taken to represent the *Aeneid* itself. In this episode, too, Vergil may himself be understood to be present as a third *vates* alongside Apollo and the Sibyl.

1.7 In a nutshell

Briefly summarized, notwithstanding the division between Books 5 and 6, the Transitional Section is unique within the *Aeneid*, in that it constitutes a single, multi-faceted, but coherent unit connecting two extended narratives of entirely different character. After the sojourn in Carthage and the commemorative games, the Transitional Section restarts the main action of the poem and modulates the tone from superficial gaiety towards the religious solemnity appropriate to the *κατάβασις*. In doing so, the Transitional Section fulfils the dual functions of recapitulation and preparation by means of a series of diverse scenes within a complex structure. Some of the scenes, too, may be perceived to have elements characteristic of drama, providing a noteworthy contrast with the narrative treatment both of the games and of the

Underworld. At the same time, in addition to intertextual engagement with earlier Greek and Latin poets, the Transitional Section is also marked by several passages which are susceptible of metapoetic interpretation, and some which can be seen as referring to Vergil himself and/or to his previous poetry.

2. Divine interference: crisis and (interim) resolution

Hinc primum Fortuna fidem mutata novavit (5.604) are the opening words of the Transitional Section. Through juxtaposition at the end of this line of a participle and a finite verb which both signify change, strong emphasis is conveyed, pointing to the adverse new development which is about to shatter the superficially happy atmosphere of the games in honour of Anchises, and which will briefly threaten the fulfilment of Aeneas' mission. That the sharp change of mood is not to be ephemeral is underlined by the forward-looking *hinc* of 5.604, which contrasts pointedly with the *hac ... tenus* at the beginning of 5.603.¹ From now on, the reader will realize, tone and atmosphere will be wholly different.

At this point, the principal action of the *Aeneid*, that is the progress of the *Aeneadae* towards the land of Ausonia/Hesperia, has been suspended during the two extended episodes which encompass the sojourn at Carthage with its retrospective account of the vicissitudes of the Trojans following the fall of their city, and the commemorative games with its diverse contests. Just as the culminating event of the games has reached its conclusion, a serious crisis flares up unexpectedly when the Trojan women are impelled to set fire to the fleet. This incident causes further delay to the onward voyage of the Trojan exiles, and thus also to the fulfilment of the next stage of the Fate expounded to Venus by Jupiter at 1.258-9: *cernes urbem et promissa Lavini | moenia*. Although the strategic objectives established by *Fatum/Fata* cannot be frustrated in the long term, scope evidently exists for the timing and aspects of detail to be modified by *Fortuna* or other agents.² Initially, personified *Fortuna* is said to have caused this delay, but only two lines later the narrative attributes responsibility to Juno through the offices of Iris.

¹ Mynors (1969) reads *hinc*, as do Williams (1960 and 1972), Conte (2009), and Rivero García, *et al.*, Vol. 2 (2011); the alternative reading of *hic* is weaker, and seems to be favoured by some older editions, such as Conington/Nettleship (1884), and the older Loeb edition, Fairclough (1935); more recently, by Monaco (1972), who places only a comma at the end of 5.603, and Bonifaz Nuño (2006).

² *Fatum/Fata* being essentially Jupiter's plan that Aeneas will reach Latium and establish a settlement for his followers and their descendants. Servius, note to 2.54, glosses *fata deum* as: '*quae dii loquuntur*'. See Lyne (1987), pp. 71-5, for a succinct discussion of Jupiter and Fate; cf. also Feeney (1991), pp. 139-40, 153-5; Taking a different view, Coleman (1982), p. 158, suggests that although in general Jupiter's will coincides with Fate, 'he himself is as bound by those decrees [*sc.* of Fate] as any of the other divine or human characters'. Either way, 'interference' by other gods or by *Fortuna* can only affect detail and timing within the overall ordained strategy. Evidently, however, exceptions are possible, as in the death of Dido (4.696-7: *nec fato ... | ...ante diem*).

The burning of the boats by the Trojan women (5.604-99) constitutes the first of five relatively short scenes which conclude Book 5. One particularly noticeable feature of four of these scenes is the renewal of direct or indirect interventions by Olympian gods (Juno, Jupiter, Venus, Neptune), directing readers' attention back to the wider context of Aeneas' divinely-ordained mission and the implacable opposition of Juno. At last, after more than seven hundred lines,³ an unwontedly drawn-out quiescence on the part of major deities is brought to a sudden end.

During the first six hundred lines of Book 5, Olympian gods had not intervened at all, it being, Heinze suggests, beneath their dignity to intervene in the games.⁴ Only a few divine or supernatural manifestations are related. For example, lesser immortals, Portunus and his entourage of Nereids, had responded to Cloanthus' prayer for victory in the ship race (5.239-42). Some time later, a somewhat unusual manifestation of the supernatural is seen in the apparent success of Eurytion's prayer to his dead brother Pandarus (5.513-8). This phenomenon is unusual since intervention on the part of deceased mortals rarely occurs unless sanctioned by the gods.⁵ Nevertheless, even though Eurytion's arrow kills the dove in flight, his feat is immediately eclipsed by the next shot, for Acestes' arrow bursts into flames and disappears into thin air (5.525-7). Aeneas attributes this portent to Jupiter (5.533-4), but the god's responsibility is only later confirmed by the apparition of Anchises (5.726-7). None of these occurrences, however, has any effect upon the main story of the poem. Indeed, given that Iris' action at 4.693-705 makes no impact on the principal action, the last intervention by a god which had influenced the plot was Mercury's visit to Aeneas at Carthage at the behest of Jupiter (4.265-78) and Mercury's subsequent reappearance in a dream (4.556-70), which resulted in the Trojans' hurried departure from that city.

Paradoxically, the destruction of a significant part of the fleet, which may at first appear to represent a serious impediment to the progress of Aeneas and the Trojans towards their goal, in fact facilitates a renewal of impetus for the main plot. Juno's resumption of her vendetta against the Trojans is the immediate cause of a series of

³ To be exact, 738 lines (4.571-5.603).

⁴ Heinze (1915), p. 483: 'bei den Wettkämpfen einzugreifen, ist unter ihrer Würde'.

⁵ Sychaeus' appearance to Dido, vouched for by Venus (1.353-9), is also exceptional, although the information imparted could possibly have become known to Dido via other (human) channels. In Book 2, Aeneas may be deemed to be embroidering his story for the benefit of Dido when he describes Hector's appearance to him in a dream (2.270-97). Similarly, Aeneas is the sole 'witness' of the appearance of Creusa (2.771-91), although this incident may be thought to have been sanctioned by the Magna Mater, since significant prophecy is conveyed. Anchises, in his apparition, specifically states: *imperio Iovis huc venio* (5.726). The possibility of a demythologized explanation of the last-mentioned incident is discussed below.

events. Following the burning of the boats, Aeneas undergoes his last major crisis of confidence, which is only resolved by supernatural intervention.⁶ This in turn leads to the foundation of Acesta/Egesta/Segesta, and then to the conversation between Venus and Neptune, which paves the way for the Palinurus episode. Of these five scenes, which run from the burning of the boats to the end of the book, the first two (5.604-99, 5.700-45) involve deities or the supernatural, while a further two involving gods bring the book to its conclusion (5.779-826, 5.827-71). Intervening between the two pairs of scenes is a short but highly significant scene describing the foundation of Acesta (5.746-78).

As already mentioned, with the return of gods and the supernatural, readers' attention is brought back to the two main themes of the poem, Aeneas' mission and Juno's opposition. At the same time, however, other subsidiary but nonetheless important themes can be identified, such as the 'other voices' woven into the fabric of the poem (especially since these are expressed here by a group of women), father-son relationships, the continuing metamorphosis of Aeneas from Trojan leader towards Roman general, and human mortality in the loss and presumed death of Palinurus. Additionally, the central scene of the five carries metaphorical and metapoetic symbolism, when Aeneas presides over the foundation of Acesta.

In this chapter I shall consider each of these thematic elements. When looking at each scene individually, I shall begin by examining the major question of the rôle played by the gods and the supernatural in the Transitional Section, given that these influences are prominent in four of the five concluding scenes of Book 5. Nothing of substance has been published concerning the gods in the *Aeneid* since Denis Feeney's extensive chapter on the subject in his monograph on the gods in epic, which was published in 1991 and has remained essentially unchallenged.⁷ Accordingly, I propose to centre my discussion around Feeney's analysis. In particular, I propose to consider whether Feeney's view is entirely sufficient, especially concerning the degree to which it may be possible to envisage, in parallel, a demythologized reading of the rôle of the gods and other supernatural phenomena in the specific context of the series of the five scenes which run from the burning of the boats to the loss overboard of Palinurus.

⁶ Aeneas exhibits brief indecision at 8.18-25, where two supernatural signs restore his resolve (the god Tiberinus and the subsequent portent of the sow and piglets); but his state of mind is perturbed by concern about potentially being outnumbered by the hostile forces gathering in Latium (8.1-17), not by fundamental doubts about whether or not to continue with his mission.

⁷ Feeney (1991), Chapter 4, pp. 129-87; positive reviews of Feeney's monograph have been published by: Dewar (1992), Gaisser (1992), and Pavlock (1993).

Here, it should be noted that the Palinurus episode is discussed in this chapter solely in relation to the ostensible responsibility of Somnus, and indirectly of Neptune, for Palinurus' misfortune, since Chapter 3 below concentrates on the questionable idea that his loss overboard and subsequent death in some way constitute a sacrifice. After discussion of the rôle of the gods and the supernatural in each of the scenes, I turn my attention to other thematic elements which are also to be found in the scenes discussed in this chapter.

2.1 Attenuation of the rôles played by the gods in the *Aeneid*

As Feeney has pointed out,⁸ the critical and intellectual climate which evolved after Homer, particularly in the Hellenistic period, led to commentators seeking, *inter alia*, to analyse and explain (sometimes to excuse) the way in which Homer had portrayed the gods, especially their levity, their immorality, and their strongly human passions.⁹ By the time of the late republic, Roman philosophic writers were openly discussing religion, exhibiting a wide diversity of ideas.¹⁰ Examples of note include, in order of publication, Lucretius' *De rerum natura* (c. 55 BCE), Nigidius Figulus' *De diis* (probably before 49),¹¹ Varro's *Antiquitates rerum divinarum* (c. 47-6),¹² and Cicero's *De natura deorum* (45), all of which were published during Vergil's earlier years,¹³ and would have been available to him even before he began writing the *Eclogues* around 42 BCE.¹⁴ Over time, also, dating from at least the Hellenistic period, but probably earlier, a triple categorization of religion had evolved, familiar to Varro and Cicero, differentiating the theology of poets, philosophers and the state.¹⁵

Probably reflecting the more sophisticated cultural context (and despite the licence evidently available to poets in treating the gods), the portrayal of immortals in the *Aeneid* is attenuated. Deities appear less often in the *Aeneid* than in the *Iliad*, speak less, and come together in council only once (10.1-117).¹⁶ On the whole, apart from

⁸ Feeney (1991), Chapter 1, pp. 5-56.

⁹ Cf. also Griffin (1986), pp. 78-9.

¹⁰ Momigliano (1984); Rawson (1985), p. 322, and, in detail, Chapter 20, pp. 298-316; Schofield (1986), p. 49.

¹¹ Nigidius was sent into exile in 49, and did not again return to Rome before his death in 45: D' Anna (2008), pp. 18-19.

¹² Horsfall (1972), p. 122, argues for late 46; Jocelyn (1982) argues for a date in the 50s (p. 165), no earlier than 58 (p. 204); rejected by Momigliano (1984), p. 205, who favours 47-6.

¹³ Of the philosophical works mentioned, the latest to have been published was Cicero's, in 45 BCE, when Vergil would have been 25 years old.

¹⁴ Servius, Proem to *Bucolica*, in Thilo & Hagen, Vol. 3.1 (1887), p. 3 ll. 26-7; Coleman (1977), p. 15.

¹⁵ Momigliano (1984), p. 202; Rawson (1985), p. 313; Feeney (1991), p. 47-8.

¹⁶ Highet (1972), p. 26.

Juno and Venus, the Vergilian gods are also less fractious than the gods in the Homeric epics. Whilst still portrayed anthropomorphically, the gods in the *Aeneid* do not descend personally to interfere on the battle-field by helping or hindering particular warriors, or even to fight amongst themselves, as do Homeric gods in the *Iliad*.¹⁷ Nor, most of the time, do the Olympian gods take direct action in the affairs of mortals to the same extent as the Homeric gods. Hence, Juno employs Iris and later Allecto and Juturna to do her bidding, and Opis acts in Diana's interest, while Jupiter despatches Mercury with his message to Aeneas at Carthage, and subsequently sends the Dira to precipitate the final act in the epic. When, however, major gods do occasionally take direct action, they do so at a particularly significant moment or for particular effect, but are not always perceived by the individuals affected, as when Neptune (unseen by the Trojans) calms the sea and rescues ships from the quicksands of the Syrtes (1.124-56), or when Juno lures Turnus away from the battle by means of a phantom, but does not make an appearance (10.636-64). Indeed, Feeney makes the point that actually seeing a god is likely to be dangerous or fatal, so gods usually appear in a dream or in disguise, often revealing themselves only as they depart.¹⁸ By way of examples, Venus reveals herself only briefly to Aeneas after conveying information to him (1.402-5), and Apollo gives advice to Ascanius, albeit initially disguised as Butes (9.638-58). Venus is the only major deity who appears to a human being more than fleetingly, but only to her own son, as when she appears to Aeneas during the fall of Troy (2.589-93), and when she appears personally to present him with his new shield (8.608-16).

Only once are gods shown entering the fray of battle (2.610-8), but here the scene is described by Venus within the account of the fall of Troy spoken by Aeneas, an interesting narrative device to permit a Homeric scene to be portrayed at two removes from the poet/narrator while also making the account more vivid and more apt to impress the principal listener, Dido. At the same time, the discreditable actions of the gods are not given the degree of prominence accorded to Demodocus' account of the adultery of Aphrodite and Ares in the *Odyssey* (8.266-369). Hence, merely brief allusion is made to the rape of Ganymede by Jupiter (1.28). Only the affecting lament of Juturna, also raped by Jupiter, commands a degree of prominence, running to almost seven lines (12.878-84).

¹⁷ Notable examples (*Iliad*) include: Apollo fighting Diomedes (5.432-44); gods joining their favoured armies (20.31-40); Athena knocking down Ares (21.403-14), and striking Aphrodite (21.423-7).

¹⁸ Feeney (1988), p. 105-6. Even the appearance of a lesser immortal can have adverse effects, as with Allecto and Turnus (7.445-55).

2.2 Scholarship on the gods in the last half-century

Given the cultural background of the late republic and early principate very briefly sketched above, and drawing upon ancient sources Feeney distils and develops his own views, combining straightforward literal and allegorical interpretations, and stressing that ‘the distinctive nature of epic fiction is no discardable superfluity’.¹⁹ He describes this approach as having a ‘stereoscopic focus’, recognizing the gods not just as fictionalized anthropomorphic actors but also at times as allegorized forces in the natural world.²⁰ On the one hand, he sees the immortals as characters in their own right, playing out their rôles separately on a different stage, and intervening from time to time in the affairs of mortals in a spirit of rivalry, although ultimately accepting the imposition of Jupiter’s will in determining the outcome of the human drama. On the other hand, and simultaneously, Neptune may be seen as representing the power of the sea, Juno the elements of weather in the lower atmosphere or *aër*, and Jupiter the upper air or *aether*. Overall, Feeney’s objective is to demonstrate that ‘the poem is intolerably impoverished if we regard the human action as the only real action’, concluding that readers should ‘accord full narrative status to the divine actors and action’.²¹ In setting out these ideas, Feeney develops further a view which had been expressed a few years previously by Michael Murrin in the context of comparative literature.²² Feeney is also at pains, however, to refute views expressed in a number of scholarly contributions published during the previous decade, which he evidently saw as diminishing the importance of the gods, and detracting from their rôle as characters. Scholars at whom Feeney directs his criticism include particularly Gordon Williams and Oliver Lyne, and to a lesser extent Robert Coleman, each of whom offers a different interpretation of the rôle of the gods in the *Aeneid*.²³ Whilst Feeney’s view is to a very considerable extent unexceptionable, however, the question arises as to whether his view is sufficient on its own, or whether some of the ideas set forth by others may not be able to supplement and enhance it, particularly in relation to the psychological state or motivation of the human characters.

¹⁹ Feeney (1991), p. 134.

²⁰ Feeney (1991), pp. 135, 132.

²¹ Feeney (1991), p. 173.

²² Murrin (1980), p. 19: ‘The divine *personae* symbolize the invisible causes of the event and ... preserve the mimetic surface of the epic, as they interact as living beings’, and: ‘In the *Aeneid* *mimesis* and symbol converge’. Cf. also, Johnson (1976), p. 146: ‘All of these agents of evil [Cupid, Allecto, the Dira] ... remain realities that exist in the space and the time of the poem which they inhabit together with the human figures’.

²³ Coleman (1982); Williams (1983), Chapter 2, pp. 17-39; Lyne (1987), Chapter 2, especially pp. 66-71.

Of the other three scholars mentioned above, Coleman had been the first to publish views on the subject. Coleman's analysis sees divine interventions in the *Aeneid* as a standard component of the epic genre, presenting at surface level 'the traditional mythology of anthropomorphic gods', and corresponding to popular piety and public religious practice in the Augustan age.²⁴ At the same time, however, Coleman notes that traditional mythology was at odds with the more sceptical thinking referred to above, which had developed in some intellectual and philosophical circles during the late Republic, when various aspects of life, including religion, had undergone a complex process of change which has been described as 'structural *differentiation*'.²⁵ Such scepticism, although not necessarily common even amongst the Roman élite,²⁶ is exemplified by the stoic Balbus in Cicero's *De natura deorum*, written around 45 BCE.²⁷ Hence, Coleman suggests that the gods in the *Aeneid* 'for all their anthropomorphic representation, are set apart from the human events that they seek to influence'.²⁸ Their interventions have two principal functions, that is, conferring upon events or individuals additional status at important moments in the narrative, and providing motivation for actions which are not adequately explained by internal psychological characterization or attendant circumstances. For the latter function, which is invoked 'to fill the gap in causation', he makes an analogy with the modern theological concept of the 'God of the gaps', which points to phenomena which science cannot explain as evidence of the existence of a supreme deity.²⁹ Overall, Coleman's interpretation comes closer to Feeney's than does either of the interpretations put forward by the other two scholars, presumably accounting for the fact that he attracts less criticism from Feeney. In particular, Coleman does not give primacy to human psychology at critical moments, thereby recognizing a significant rôle for the gods as instigators of human actions. Nevertheless, he expresses concern that anthropomorphic realism carries the risk of dangerously undermining traditional mythology, and criticizes what he considers to be the occasional excessive anthropomorphism of the gods.³⁰

²⁴ Coleman (1982), pp. 161-2.

²⁵ Beard, *et al.* (1998), Vol. 1, p. 149; Momigliano (1984), p. 202, also speaks of 'the conflict between philosophy and city-religion'.

²⁶ Beard, *et al.* (1998), Vol. 1, p. 150.

²⁷ Coleman (1982), pp. 143-4, citing Cicero, *De natura deorum* (2.[24-7].63-9) where the gods are explained as allegorized elements of nature.

²⁸ Coleman (1982), pp. 145.

²⁹ Coleman (1982), pp. 153, 161. Coining the phrase is attributed to Charles Alfred Coulson in a work dated 1955, but the concept goes back to the nineteenth century.

³⁰ Coleman (1982), p. 162; also, p. 163, which describes the Venus and Vulcan episode (8.370-406) as an 'egregious instance of frivolous anthropomorphism'.

Williams offers the most radical view, developing a line of interpretation which may be said to have had its origins in Xenophanes, who as the earliest known critic of Homer, rejected the Homeric gods as ‘fictions of the ancients’.³¹ Heinze in the early twentieth century adopted and adapted similar views.³² Accordingly, Williams proposes a wholly demythologized reading of the rôle of the gods, seeking to explain away the divine machinery. In this way, Williams effectively removes the mystique created by supernatural elements, considering them overstated to the point of implausibility. For example, he describes the scene between Juno and Aeolus in Book 1 as ‘pure rococo’.³³ Hence, he argues that interventions by the gods, together with divinely-inspired oracles, visions, portents, and dreams, are to be interpreted metaphorically, as symbols representing rational, natural causes, or psychological factors in character motivation.

Lyne is closer to Coleman in his interpretation, except that he sees the gods’ rôle in relation to human motivation as assisting rather than acting as prime movers. Accepting a version of double or parallel motivation, Lyne describes the function fulfilled by the gods as ‘working with’ pre-existing human emotions.³⁴ In his view, therefore, the gods do not inspire motives for which the germ does not already exist embryonically within the hearts and minds of characters, but they do increase such motivations in intensity.

Unfortunately, none of the scholars cited above discusses all four of the pertinent scenes in the latter part of Book 5. Nor does any of them formally extend his terms of reference to take account of supernatural phenomena which may not, strictly speaking, involve deities. Occurrences of this latter type are represented in the Transitional Section by the episode in which Aeneas is said to ‘see’ and ‘hear’ his father, Anchises (5.722-42). In fact, the status of Anchises’ spirit is not made explicit in the poem, for although he may not strictly be a god, Harrison has drawn attention to intimations that Anchises may have been apotheosized.³⁵ He is, in any event, privileged to reside in

³¹ πλάσματα προτέρων: Diels and Kranz (1964), Vol. 1, p. 128 (Xenophanes B.1.22).

³² Heinze (1915), p. 305, suggests that Vergil effects ‘eine bewußte Umsetzung einfacher psychologischer Vorgänge in die Form göttlicher Einwirkung’.

³³ Williams (1983), p. 28, where he also states: ‘Not only are we not being asked to believe; we are being asked not to believe’.

³⁴ Lyne (1978), p. 66-7. See also Quinn (1968), pp. 316-20, for a useful discussion of ‘Parallel divine and psychological motivation’.

³⁵ Harrison (1985), pp. 104-5, discussing the incident of the snake at Anchises’ tomb (5.84-9); Harrison (2006), pp. 162-3, noting that Anchises is referred to by Aeneas as *divinique ... parentis* (5.47), suggests that the ritual sacrifice at 5.58-63 celebrates the apotheosis of Anchises, paralleling the posthumous treatment of Julius Caesar in the years 44-29. Aeneas, like Augustus, may therefore also be *divi filius* on his father’s side.

Elysium (5.733-5), where, if not actually deified, he has apparently attained a high spiritual status, even if still perhaps undergoing the final stage of purification.³⁶ Accordingly, he is effectively enjoying a form of immortality until finally purified upon the completion of the cycle of time, and is exempted from the repetitive process of metempsychosis which causes most other spirits to become mortal again (6.744-7). Moreover, on this occasion, Anchises states explicitly that his appearance is at the behest of Jupiter (5.726). It is strange that scholars concerned with the deities have omitted to give consideration also to such supernatural manifestations, especially when considering the possibility of a wholly demythologized reading of the *Aeneid*. Indeed, unless these phenomena are wholly demythologized, they must form an integral part of the divinely-ordained structure of the universe, and cannot be imagined as occurring without the sanction of the relevant god(s).

In the sections which follow, I propose to look at each of the five final scenes of Book 5, focusing initially, in four of the five scenes, on the instances of divine or supernatural intervention which occur, and subsequently on other themes. All of the instances of divine or supernatural intervention can be interpreted without difficulty in accordance with Feeney's view. My purpose, therefore, when looking at these is to assess the degree to which, if at all, other theories may offer support towards a richer, more comprehensive interpretation on more than one level.

2.3 The burning of the fleet

This episode is the only one discussed by all four of the scholars cited above.³⁷ Two Olympian gods are said to be responsible for the interventions in this episode, namely Juno, working through the agency of Iris, and Jupiter. Concerning divine intervention, three questions need to be addressed. Firstly, is responsibility for the women's rebellious action to be attributed solely to incitement by Juno's *agente provocatrice*? Secondly, does Jupiter initiate the heavy rain storm which extinguishes the fire? Thirdly, what interpretation should be placed on Pyrgo's unmasking of the 'false Beroë', which occurs between the actions of Iris and Jupiter?

³⁶ Williams, R D (1972), p. 504, note to 6.743 ff.: 'Elysium, in the underworld is the penultimate paradise – the real paradise is in heaven'; cf. also Williams, R D (1964), pp. 57-8; Clark (1978/9), pp. 176-9; Horsfall (2013), pp. 499-505, notes on 6.743, 744, 745.

³⁷ Coleman (1982), pp. 147-8, 151, 156, 160; Williams (1983), pp. 21-2; Lyne (1987), p. 70; Feeney (1991), pp. 146, 175-6.

So far as the women are concerned, even before Iris has arrived they are patently in a very unsettled and volatile state of mind as a result of seven (at least) wearying years of wandering,³⁸ during which abortive attempts had been made to found a city, firstly in Thrace (3.18) and then in Crete (3.133). Two and a half lines summarize the unanimity of their mood in deploring their past and present suffering and praying for a permanent settlement:

heu tot vada fessis
et tantum superesse maris, vox omnibus una;
urbem orant, taedet pelagi perferre laborem. (5.615-7)³⁹

Focalized through the women themselves, these condensed but moving lines are extremely effective in communicating the atmosphere of frustration. Moreover, the reported speech of 5.615-6, with the interjection ‘heu’ is almost vocalized as direct speech.⁴⁰ It is therefore more than a little surprising that Coleman considers that their mood is not sufficient to lead to rebellious action.⁴¹ As it happens, a trigger is provided by the goddess, even though not necessary in psychological terms. Indeed, in the heightened emotional atmosphere engendered by the lamentations over the remembrance of Anchises, and in the absence of the repressive influence of the men attending the games, it seems perfectly natural to consider that tensions could have reached such a level of crisis as to have overflowed into aggressive action without the need for any additional stimulus.⁴²

Even easier to regard as natural is the timely supervision of a rain shower which is sufficiently heavy and protracted to put out the fire. Happy coincidence it certainly is, but not at all an implausible weather event. Here, again, therefore, it is possible to demythologize, considering the shower merely fortuitous, or regarding Jupiter purely

³⁸ *septima ... aestas* (5.626), spoken by Iris-Beroë is at odds with *septima ... | ... aestas* (1.755-6) spoken by Dido the previous year. See below for Nugent’s view that this discrepancy is intentional on the part of Iris.

³⁹ Williams, R D (1960), p. 160, note to 5.615-6, suggests that there is ‘much to be said’ for referring the expression of unanimity in 5.616 both forward to 5.617 as well as back to 5.615.

⁴⁰ Highet (1972), p. 342.

⁴¹ Coleman (1982), p. 151: ‘Nothing in their character or even in their present dispirited mood has indicated the possibility of such aggressive frenzy. Their behaviour is inexplicable in terms of ordinary human motivation’. Conversely, Quinn (1968), p. 156, finds that on the human level, the women’s motivation is ‘psychologically convincing’.

⁴² Tiberius Claudius Donatus (Georgii (1905), Vol. 1, p. 493, ll. 2-11) summarizes the external factors well, but undermines his analysis by including a misogynistic slur on the ‘weak intellect’ (*ingenium leve*) of the women. Keith (2000), p. 26, rightly draws attention to Donatus’ ‘generally low estimate of female nature’.

allegorically as the complex of forces which govern storms in the upper atmosphere, in much the same way as Volcanus stands for the raging fire at 5.662.

What makes it nearly impossible to demythologize this episode completely, however, as indeed Feeney observes,⁴³ is the ‘unmasking’ of Iris by Pyrgo (5.646: *non Beroe vobis*). Although it would have been possible for the trigger which launches violent action to have been couched in purely human terms, based upon the build-up of tensions discussed above, Pyrgo’s denunciation of the false Beroë, and Iris’ reaction cannot be ignored. In particular, the information imparted by Pyrgo (which would have been verifiable by the other women) to the effect that Beroë was elsewhere and indisposed (5.650-2) would seem to preclude an alternative, rational explanation of the appearance of Iris/Beroë. Indeed, the choice of a disguise that would be shown to be false is a clever devious aspect of Iris’ plan which more or less guarantees a reason for her to reveal herself as a goddess and thereby to impart the final impetus for the women’s action.⁴⁴ Williams does not satisfactorily address this problem. Although he does refer to Pyrgo’s intervention, he apparently does not see it as a difficulty, and treats the whole episode as an example of the gods as a ‘trope for human motivation’.⁴⁵ When, however, he also describes the episode as an instance of ‘double motivation’, in which ‘What Iris does is to transform that psychological state into action’, his position seems closer to that subsequently elaborated by Lyne, who interprets the intervention by Iris as ‘working with’ the evident, pre-existing human motivation.⁴⁶ One other curious detail in Iris’ speech might also perhaps have caused the women to have been suspicious, had they not been under such stress. In addressing the women, Iris invokes Cassandra by way of authority (5.636).⁴⁷ Under more normal circumstances, however, the utterances of Cassandra could have been expected to be disregarded by the women, as was the case when she predicted imminent disaster after the death of Laocoön (2.246-7)⁴⁸. Indeed, a parallel may be perceived between the warnings given by Pyrgo and Laocoön, since neither has its intended effect and both are followed by destruction.⁴⁹

⁴³ Feeney (1991), p. 176.

⁴⁴ Nugent (1992), p. 279 n. 52, also suggests that the discrepancy over ‘*septima aestas*’, noted above, is part of Iris’ stratagem to ensure that her disguise is penetrated.

⁴⁵ Williams (1983), pp. 20-2.

⁴⁶ Williams (1983), p. 22; Lyne (1987), p. 70.

⁴⁷ Nugent (1992), pp. 280-1, viewed as another aspect of the implausibility of Iris’ disguise.

⁴⁸ *ora ... non umquam credita Teucris* (2.247). Servius noted the reference at 5.636: ‘*NAM MIHI CASSANDRAE non cui credere non debebant, sed cui cum sua pernicie non crediderant*’; but his comment is unhelpful, presumably making the assumption that since Cassandra’s death the women must somehow have reflected on the accuracy of her disregarded prophecies.

⁴⁹ Paschalis (1997), p. 198.

To summarize regarding the gods, therefore, this scene can readily be interpreted according to Feeney, whilst Williams' demythologization is difficult to sustain throughout. Yet the human motivation is clearly expressed and sufficient to stand on its own. Although undoubtedly the significance of the incident is given an enhanced status by the divine presence, there is no need for the additional impetus which Coleman considers necessary. Overall, Lyne's suggestion of the gods working with pre-existing human motivation seems an apposite complement to Feeney's interpretation here.

Quite apart from the question of divine and supernatural involvement, this episode is also particularly significant because of the strength accorded to the 'other voices' expressed by the women, for this is the only instance in the whole poem where a serious obstacle to Aeneas' mission originates from within the community of Trojan exiles. Furthermore, the opposition arises in the neglected and repressed community of women, who not only express seditious views, but also take action which results in the loss of four ships out of the nineteen which had left Carthage. Elsewhere, only the intense grief experienced by Euryalus' unnamed mother and expressed at some length (9.473-97) reaches a level which even threatens serious damage to the Trojan cause from within its own community.⁵⁰ Just as Euryalus' mother's speech begins to undermine the morale of the Trojan soldiers (9.498-9), however, one of the male commanders in Aeneas' absence acts to prevent further damage. Euryalus' mother is therefore carried off to her quarters on the orders of Ilioneus (9.500-2). Her outbreak of maternal grief does not, then, lead to physical damage. In other parts of the poem, in the more regulated circumstances of Polydorus' (re)burial and the return of Pallas' body to his father, female grief remains within the bounds of 'appropriate conduct' (*de more*) and is accorded only a minimum of space (one line only at 3.65 and 11.35 respectively).⁵¹ Similarly, Creusa's maternal feelings are treated fairly briefly when, fearing above all for the well-being of her son, she clings to Aeneas' feet as a suppliant (2.673-9).

In setting fire to the boats, the Trojan women as a group are moved to a unique act of violence against their own people, as Ascanius is quick to point out (5.671-2). Whether or not their action is divinely inspired, the scene illustrates, vividly but briefly, the plight of women forced from their own country and homeless for several years.

⁵⁰ Given that Euryalus' mother evidently has a noble pedigree, somehow related to Priam (9.284-5), her anonymity is particularly surprising, and strongly suggests two points: on the one hand, the unimportance of women in this male-dominated context; on the other hand the generic nature of her suffering as symbolic of other bereaved mothers.

⁵¹ These two lines are identical apart from the second word: *et circum*[3.65]/*maestum*[11.35] *Iliades crinem de more solutae*.

Nugent rightly sees this episode in the context of ‘a gender politics’, which pervades the *Aeneid* and is ‘part of a continuing counterpoint in the text, as female characters question the dominant narrative of empire’.⁵² Hence she links the Trojan women of Book 5 not only with Euryalus’ mother, but also with non-Trojan women, such as Dido, Camilla, Amata, and Juturna, who all ‘suggest the possibility of choice and independent volition’, thus representing obstacles to Aeneas as he endeavours to fulfil his mission.⁵³ Paul Allen Miller similarly views women as threats in general, associating them also with fire imagery,⁵⁴ while Babcock sees the women and others left behind at Acesta symbolically, as part of the process of discarding ‘elements representative of the past’, a process which will also entail the loss of Palinurus and Caieta.⁵⁵

Nugent’s view that the outcome of the women’s short-lived rebellion is a failure, however, is less convincing. In support of this interpretation she cites the almost immediate ‘repudiation’ by the women of their action (*piget incepti*: 5.678) and their apparent wish, later, to join the group continuing the journey to Italy (*ipsae iam matres ... | ... ire volunt*: 5.767-9).⁵⁶ To the extent that Aeneas is not prevented from fulfilling his destiny, the women do indeed fail. Yet neither of the points cited by Nugent is entirely conclusive. In particular, although the regret which the women are said to experience may to some extent be genuine, it can equally well be interpreted as the entirely natural reaction of those who fear the consequences after being discovered in an act of which ‘Authority’ (here, the dominant male population) disapproves. Similarly, parting company from co-travellers, most of whom they have known since even before the embarkation from Antandros, and whose (mis)adventures they have shared, is no doubt an emotional experience which manifests itself briefly in the wish to join the adventurers in their further voyage. Notwithstanding what may be some degree of understandable ambivalence on the part of the women, however, their action has to be recognized as at least partially successful when judged by criteria other than those attributable to the dominant males and outside the context of Aeneas’ fated destiny. For themselves (and no doubt their younger children), as well as for a number of aged or less audacious men, the women gain the security of a home with a trusted ruler of Trojan stock (*consanguineo ... Acestae*: 5.771), whom Aeneas has treated with considerable respect and has even addressed as *pater* (5.533). Viewed from a historical

⁵² Nugent in *The Virgil encyclopedia* (2014), Vol. 1, p. 1166, s.v. ‘Ship burning’.

⁵³ Nugent (1999), p. 263.

⁵⁴ Miller (1995).

⁵⁵ Babcock (1992), p. 40.

⁵⁶ Nugent (1992), pp. 281, 271; Nugent (1999), p. 263.

perspective, they are also successful since some of them will become the ancestors of the inhabitants of Segesta who will support the Roman cause against the Carthaginians several centuries later. In any event, however interpreted this episode highlights an alternative and, under some lights, 'negative' outlook which runs counter to the longer-term mission. Yet, at the same time, the foundation of Acesta solves the unnarrated problem of how to resume the journey to Latium with fewer ships than before.

Worthy of a final comment in this scene is also the behaviour of Ascanius. As first to arrive at the harbour, he anticipates his father's reaction, for his immediate instinct is to remonstrate with the women in the manner of a man of authority, drawing particular attention to the fact that their hostile action is directed against their own people. Moreover, his intervention demonstrates the emergence of an inherent trait of leadership as opposed to the technical skills learnt from his guardian and companion Epytides (5.547, 579). Ascanius has evidently made a quantum leap in maturity here since being held on Dido's lap in Carthage (1.717-8),⁵⁷ and is developing in character as befits the natural successor to Aeneas. As Anne Rogerson has pointed out, however, some ambiguity and negative overtones also attend the intervention of Ascanius. For example, it is impossible to tell whether the women recognize and respond to Ascanius' remonstrations, since he is 'upstaged' by the arrival of Aeneas and followers.⁵⁸ Furthermore, Rogerson points out that the women's action is even more sinister than is immediately obvious, given that they are said to be burning their hopes (*vestras spes uritis*: 5.672), a metaphorical threat to Ascanius himself, who is referred to at various times in terms expressing hope for the future (1.556, 4.274, 12.168). Although Ascanius' intervention is not followed through any further at this point, in highlighting Ascanius' progress the scene prefigures later stages of his metamorphosis into manhood, and symbolizes hope for the future.⁵⁹ At 7.477-99, he is seen engaging in the adult pursuit of hunting, although his 'success' results in his killing of Silvia's stag, with disastrous consequences. Subsequently, he succeeds in his first bellicose action when he kills the Rutulian warrior, Numanus Remulus (9.590-4, 632-4). The father-son relationship implicit here also reflects the closeness of Aeneas and Anchises earlier in

⁵⁷ Strictly speaking, it is not Ascanius sitting on Dido's lap, but his uncle, Cupid. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to assume that in manner and character, as well as in appearance, Cupid corresponds closely to Ascanius so as not to cause Ascanius' father or others to see through the deception.

⁵⁸ Rogerson (2005), p. 107. Referring to an earlier discussion of Ascanius in Oliensis (2001), pp. 58-9, Rogerson also notes the intensification of the perceived threat through the similarity of the self-revelation of Ascanius to that of Euripides' Pentheus in the face of Agave and the Bacchae. Also: Oliensis (2009), pp. 68-70; McAuley (2016), p. 82.

⁵⁹ Rogerson (forthcoming, 2017) sees Ascanius as 'a symbol of hope throughout the epic', and investigates the symbolic aspect and implications of Ascanius' indeterminable age.

the poem and looks ahead to the next scene and the journey through the Underworld. In terms of dynastic succession, a degree of contemporary political anxiety may also be discerned beneath this incident, given the recent death in 23 BCE of Augustus' nephew, son-in-law, and heir presumptive, Marcus Claudius Marcellus.

2.4 Aeneas and Anchises

Since the four scholars cited do not devote any attention to supernatural manifestations not directly involving a deity, none of them addresses this scene. Yet, this passage, together with the Palinurus episode, is amongst the scenes in the *Aeneid* which more obviously lend themselves to possible demythologization. In view of Aeneas' state of mind at this juncture, no serious obstacle would stand in the way of interpreting the night-time 'apparition' as a dream, or as a waking vision, or as some form of hallucination in the leader's tortured mind (or, in the extreme, as a fabrication designed to give to a decision already made the weight of a feigned supernatural instruction). Despite the sensible advice already given to him by Nautes, Aeneas remains undecided as to whether to continue with his mission. Hence, the apparition may be seen to represent the voice of duty within Aeneas' conscience as he vacillates over whether to take the easier, practical option of remaining in Sicily, or to persevere with his mission. Moreover, the text does not indicate whether this apparition is an external, supernatural phenomenon or part of an internal debate within Aeneas' head.⁶⁰ All the reader knows is that Anchises' face or likeness (*facies*: 5.722) seems (or is seen) to pour forth speech (*visa ... | ... effundere voces*: 5.722-3). Only the immaterial nature of the apparition is vouchsafed (*ceu fumus in auras*: 5.740), just before Aeneas speaks of embracing his father (5.742).

Again, one detail in this episode renders it very difficult to demythologize completely. Without acknowledging some religious or supernatural belief system, not only would Anchises' instruction to Aeneas to visit him in the house of Dis (5.731-3) and to learn about future generations (5.737) need to be interpreted as a construct of Aeneas' disturbed imagination, but the visit itself in the latter half of Book 6 would also have to be interpreted as a dream or a vision. Such an interpretation has, in fact, been given consideration even from quite early times. In particular, Servius links the elm

⁶⁰ In a later scene which has some similarity, Tiberinus' states that his appearance is no mere dream (*ne vana putes haec fingere somnum*: 8.42). Although this admonition may carry some weight, words placed in the mouth of an apparition 'seen' by Aeneas alone during his sleep (as confirmed at 8.30 and 8.67) can only be indicative, not conclusive.

tree bearing vain dreams as Aeneas enters the Underworld (6.282-4) with the ivory gate of false dreams through which he leaves (6.897-8), concluding that these things show that everything is simulated and false.⁶¹ Much more recently, building on a dialogue and commentary by the fifteenth-century scholar, Cristoforo Landino, Murrin has also discussed the interpretation of the *Aeneid* in its entirety as a philosophical allegory, including especially the divine and supernatural interventions.⁶² Similarly, Alain Deremetz has postulated a metapoetical interpretation in which the journey through the Underworld reflects the experience of the poet in writing his epic.⁶³ Nevertheless, although Anchises' didactic speech in the Underworld (6.724-51) invites philosophical analysis of at least part of the visit, and a metapoetic interpretation also works in parallel, the prophetic elements are difficult to explain without acceptance, if only temporarily, of some determining, numinous influence which stands as authority behind the predictions. The degree of accuracy and historical detail provided in the parade of heroes is unparalleled in reports of dreams real or fictitious.⁶⁴ At the same time, the poetic aura of mysticism conjured up by this apparition would be devalued if the whole scene were viewed as no more than a continuation of Aeneas' psychological crisis.

Overall, while this episode (5.721-42) fits Feeney's view well, sufficient indicators point to Aeneas' agitated mental condition to suggest that the supernatural manifestation can simultaneously bear a psychological interpretation. In particular, the provision of both human and supernatural encouragement, albeit with slightly different emphases, is a clear instance of double motivation. With Coleman, the supernatural intervention obviously enhances the status of this critical moment. On the other hand, it is not a case of bolstering weak or non-existent human motivation. That motivation already existed, but was temporarily thrown off balance by a serious psychological shock. Again, therefore, Lyne's view seems an appropriate complement, here 'working with' Aeneas' conscience to resolve a state of mental confusion.

Aside from the divine and supernatural, this episode is also pivotal for the metamorphosis of Aeneas from Trojan leader to (proto-)Roman general. Having gone astray during the sojourn in Carthage, Aeneas had begun to regain his authority and moral character during the games, which showed him as pious, fair, generous, good-humoured, and paternalistic. Thrown into crisis by the actual loss of four ships and by

⁶¹ Servius, note to 6.282: '*quae res haec omnia indicat esse simulata, si et ingressus et exitus simulatus est et falsus*'.

⁶² Murrin (1980), pp. 39-42, 50.

⁶³ Deremetz (1995), pp. 157-65.

⁶⁴ Jenkins (1998), p. 448, firmly rejects the idea of a dream.

the psychological shock of the audacity of the women, Aeneas recovers his resolve after receiving both human and supernatural advice. Henceforth, he grows steadily in stature. In the next scene, he is instrumental in the foundation of an important new city, which may stand as a proxy for Rome (see below). Subsequently, he symbolically takes over the helm of the nation following the loss of Palinurus, and in the longer term shows himself to be a formidable war leader. Henceforth, Aeneas scarcely wavers, except for his much less serious moment of indecision at 8.18-25, which is concerned with his short-term military predicament rather than with the fundamental issue of the completion of his mission.

2.5 Rome founded in Sicily

With two scenes involving the gods or the supernatural placed on either side, the account of the foundation of Acesta is aptly located in view of the religious significance accorded to the foundation of a city. Although the poem as a whole has some of the character of a foundation myth,⁶⁵ no successful foundation of a city is described in the *Aeneid*, except for Acesta. Indeed, Aeneas twice fails to establish a viable settlement, firstly in Thrace (3.18),⁶⁶ and subsequently Pergamum on Crete (3.133). Later, he visits cities elsewhere which have been founded successfully in the relatively recent past, namely Carthage and Buthrotum (3.293). Of these, Carthage, where Aeneas involves himself in some of the construction work (4.260), had already been founded by Dido and her Tyrians. Buthrotum, on the other hand, under the rule of Helenus and Andromache is very much rooted in the past, a miniature replica of Troy, reusing the names of Pergamum, Xanthus, and the Scaean Gate (*parvam Troiam ... | ... | ... adgnosco*: 3.349-51), as well as Simois (3.302).⁶⁷ In this city, despite her deliverance from slavery following the death of Neoptolemus/Pyrrihus and her subsequent remarriage to another Trojan prince, Andromache continues to be focused on the past, mourning both Hector and Astyanax at their twin shrines (3.300-5). Acesta, however, celebrated in the only ktistic episode in the *Aeneid*, is more forward-looking, reusing only the names of Ilium and Troy (5.756). Not only is Acesta established by Aeneas personally, observing the Roman ritual of ploughing the boundaries (*Aeneas urbem*

⁶⁵ Hardie (1986), pp. 68, 142, 190; Miles (1999); Reed (2007), p. 1.

⁶⁶ In notes to 3.18, Williams (1972), p. 269, Horsfall (2013), p. 57, indicate that either Aenus or Aeneia may be alluded to, with *Aeneadae* being the name of the people, as elsewhere.

⁶⁷ Carney (1986), p. 423, describes Buthrotum as 'dangerously committed to a failed past'; Nugent (1992), p. 280, suggests that this 'pseudo-Troy' is 'self-delusion' on the part of Andromache and Helenus.

designat aratro: 5.755),⁶⁸ but the city also immediately acquires familiar Roman features such as a forum and an assembly of elders resembling a senate (*forum et patribus ... vocatis: 5.758*). Although Zoja Pavlovskis describes Acesta as ‘Troy renewed on foreign soil’, it is more satisfactory to see Acesta as the next in a succession of post-Trojan settlements, not all successful, from the first brief attempt in Thrace, through Pergamum and Buthrotum, to Acesta itself, each physically and metaphorically further away from Troy and closer to Rome. As Pavlovskis indeed notes, Acesta is prefigured by Buthrotum, but each of the attempts at foundation prefigures the next and looks ahead ultimately to the foundation of Rome.⁶⁹

Clearly, therefore, the foundation scene of Book 5 has particular importance representing not only the city of Lavinium, which Aeneas is destined to found soon after his victory at the end of Book 12, but also more symbolically the foundation of Alba Longa by Ascanius/Iulus, and above all in the far-distant future the foundation of Rome by their later descendants. As such, the passage needs to be read keeping in mind the description of the future site of Rome in Book 8, where the undeveloped sites named in the text will eventually be populated by buildings similar to but more splendid than those erected in Acesta, especially after the Augustan rebuilding programme.⁷⁰ Additionally, the geographical location of this pre-Roman foundation is also significant, pointing both to Sicily as the first Roman province, and, more specifically paying tribute to Segesta which became an important ally of Rome during the First Punic War (264-41 BCE) at least in part because of the tradition of its Trojan heritage.⁷¹

Amid this scene of constructive activity, the alert reader will probably also perceive some reference to the process of writing. As Catharine Edwards has noted, various Roman authors of the Augustan period, notably Livy, Horace, and Propertius, associated the construction of buildings and monuments with their own written works in terms of the labour input and the longevity of the end-product.⁷² Most recently, this theme has been developed further by Bettina Reitz-Joosse, who suggests that the

⁶⁸ Manganaro in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* I (1984), p. 19, s.v. ‘Acesta’; cf. Also Carney (1986), p. 423, concerning the importance of the ploughing of the boundaries.

⁶⁹ Pavlovskis (1976), p. 203, with n. 38.

⁷⁰ Places mentioned include: the Carmental Gate (8.338), Romulus’ Asylum and the Lupercal (8.342-3), the Forum Romanum and the Carinae (8.361)

⁷¹ Fratanuono in *The Virgil encyclopedia* I (2014), p. 4, s.v. ‘Acesta’; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ῥωμαϊκὴ ἀρχαιολογία*, 1.52.1-3 relates the arrival of Trojans in Sicily before Aeneas; 1.52.4 mentions the foundation of Acesta (Ἀῖγεστα); references to a Trojan presence in Sicily date back at least to Thucydides (6.2.3).

⁷² Edwards (1996), pp. 6-7, citing, *inter alia*, Propertius 4.1.67, referring to his own poetry: *Roma, faue, tibi surgit opus*; see also Harrison (2006), p. 160, concerning buildings compared to works of literature in antiquity.

construction of cities and their implicit reference to Rome in Vergil's epic 'relate to the poetic endeavour of the *Aeneid* itself'.⁷³ In her view, these construction metaphors taken together constitute a 'megametaphor of foundation' which runs through the whole poem.⁷⁴ This linkage rings true, since in much the same way as Aeneas mapped out the physical bounds of the new city, Vergil is reported to have given careful attention to the architecture of the *Aeneid* by first writing a prose outline.⁷⁵ Moreover, amongst the institutions founded in Acesta, of some note is the Temple of Venus erected on the summit of Mount Eryx (5.759-60), which calls to mind the metaphorical and metaliterary temple, referring to the *Aeneid*, which Vergil had promised to build in the *Georgics* (3.13). At the same time, readers may also probably think of the temples of Venus Erycina at Rome on the Capitol and the Quirinal, as well as possibly the temple of Venus Genetrix.⁷⁶

While the foundation of Acesta is thoroughly positive when viewed in the context of the progression of Trojan attempts at settlement, which will culminate in the foundation of Rome, the Trojans' ultimate success may also cause some readers to reflect on a different context, namely the status and fate of the numerous non-Trojan cities mentioned at various points throughout the poem. Indeed, by way of contrast with the constructive theme of city foundation, Joseph D Reed has identified a more negative city-related theme. He points out that several cities in the poem are described as [*urbs*] *antiqua*, including Troy, Carthage, Ardea, Privernum, Tyre, and Calydon. Whilst this epithet suggests a degree of distinction and nobility, Reed also points out that all of these cities were conquered or destroyed during the course of Roman imperial expansion, or even earlier. Moreover, these cities are all, in Reed's words, 'metaphors for each other', and, from an Augustan perspective, 'has-beens'.⁷⁷ Similarly, in an earlier article which draws attention to a list of eight cities of the Latin League recited by Anchises in the Underworld (6.773-6), Denis Feeney had observed that while all of the cities had been of some note, all had subsequently been 'swallowed into obscurity by the dominance of the metropolis'.⁷⁸ By Vergil's time, therefore, these cities, too,

⁷³ Reitz-Joosse (2013), p. 126 (unpublished University of Leiden doctoral thesis, seen courtesy of the author), expected to be the basis of a monograph to be published by OUP in the USA in 2017.

⁷⁴ Reitz-Joosse (2013), p. 135, and p. 113 n. 37 concerning megametaphors.

⁷⁵ Suetonius, *Vita Vergili*, 23; Brugnoli & Stok (1997), p. 28 (*Vita Donatiana e vita Suetoniana desumpta*, §23), pp. 91-2 (*Vita quae Donati aucti dicitur*, §34).

⁷⁶ The temple of Venus Genetrix was not one of those restored during the Augustan building programme, but was relatively new, having been dedicated by Julius Caesar in 46 BCE (Cassius Dio XLIII.22.2-3).

⁷⁷ Reed (2007), Chapter 5, pp. 129-47, especially pp. 138-9.

⁷⁸ Feeney (1986), pp. 7-8, 16, 18. The cities are: Nomentum, Gabii, Fidenae, Collatia, Pometia, Castrum Inui, Bola, and Cora.

were ‘has-beens’. Separately, Philip Hardie has also drawn attention to the theme of mutability and decay in the fortunes of cities as seen in Latin literature.⁷⁹

Acesta as a successful Trojan/pre-Roman settlement may thus be seen not only to herald the future foundation of Rome, but also to fit within a broader context of long-term decline and destruction, with possibly an underlying message also that in the long term all cities are subject to eclipse, decay or worse. A little later in the text, Cnossus, too, in the dark ekphrasis which will be discussed in Chapter 4, although not described as *antiqua*, may similarly be deemed to be a ‘has-been’, for not only is the city rooted in mythological time, but by Augustan times Crete had become part of the Roman province of Crete and Cyrenaica. Furthermore, the site of the city of Cnossus had been abandoned, superseded by the nearby new town of *Colonia Iulia Nobilis Cnossus*.⁸⁰ Hence, within the Transitional Section, while Acesta symbolizes (perhaps somewhat ambiguously) progress, Cnossus may be taken to symbolize decay.

2.6 Venus and Neptune

Of the four scholars cited, only Coleman mentions this episode,⁸¹ although he does not adduce it in support of his principal arguments. Rather the contrary, in fact, for Coleman cites this conversation as an example free of what he considers to be ‘the overdrawn anthropomorphism that elsewhere impedes our suspension of disbelief’.⁸² Elsewhere, in speaking generally of Venus’ interventions throughout the poem, he also asserts that ‘on each occasion the incident can be demythologized very simply as “a piece of unexpected and indeed inexplicable good luck”. But it is given an explication, and one that confers status upon the hero and his fortunes’.⁸³ Yet, while the conversation between Venus and Neptune can indeed be said to confer status upon Aeneas by demonstrating that he has powerful supporters in the divine hierarchy, offsetting the antagonism of Juno, it is difficult to accept that the encounter of these two gods can be demythologized. As with Anchises’ invitation to Aeneas, here too, a belief system is required to account for Neptune’s ability to foresee or ordain that a loss at sea

⁷⁹ Hardie (1992), pp. 59-61.

⁸⁰ Chaniotis (1999), p. 280; Armstrong (2006), p. 309; Price, *et al.* in *OCD* 4E (2012), p. 340, s.v. Cnossus.

⁸¹ Coleman (1982), pp. 148, 156, 158, 163.

⁸² Coleman (1982), p. 163.

⁸³ Coleman (1982), p. 157.

and a death will take place in the course of the journey to the Tiber (5.814-5).⁸⁴ When these predicted events actually take place, it would be scarcely credible to try to dismiss them as purely coincidental.

This episode is quasi-dramatic in character, consisting predominantly of direct speech, roughly equally divided between the two interlocutors.⁸⁵ It sits in the middle of a structural pattern of dialogues between gods which are located near the beginning, middle and end of the poem, the other two dialogues being between Venus and Jupiter (1.227-96), and between Jupiter and Juno (12.791-842). Nelis demonstrates that Vergil's model for the conversation of Venus and Neptune is Hera's intervention in favour of Jason for a safe journey from Aeaea to Phaeacia in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica* (4.753-981), noting *inter alia* the presence of Thetis in both episodes.⁸⁶ Through this rôle reversal, Vergil by implication contrasts Juno's beneficence in Apollonius Rhodius' epic with her malevolence in the *Aeneid*. Although, in highlighting the allusion, Nelis indicates 'there is no Homeric model',⁸⁷ the scenario in which a distressed Venus seeks support for her son from a more powerful god (as, also, at 1.227-53) is nevertheless reminiscent of two Homeric episodes, where Thetis comes to Zeus as a suppliant on behalf of her son (*Iliad* 1.495-527) and where Athena asks for help from Zeus for her protégé (*Odyssey* 5.5-27). Related to the one-to-one conversations of the gods in the *Aeneid* is also the more extensive three-way debate during the council of the gods (10.1-117). In another pattern, also, the favourable intervention of Venus at this moment counterbalances Juno's hostile initiative which had triggered Aeneas' crisis two scenes previously.⁸⁸

Considered against this background, with the literary balancing of opposing deities, the episode seems most susceptible of a literal interpretation, even though a parallel demythologized reading of Neptune's rôle is possible, interpreting him, as elsewhere, as representing the marine forces in nature. Equally, Venus may also be seen in parallel as a mother figure and therefore representative of generations of the Roman people. Viewing Venus more generally simply as a benign life force, however, as in the preamble to Lucretius' *De rerum natura* (1.1-9), is too weak and less convincing in this context.

⁸⁴ Whether Neptune's utterance is merely a prediction or a 'price' for the safe passage is not relevant here, but is discussed in Chapter 3, below.

⁸⁵ Venus: 18 lines; Neptune: 16; narrative: 14.

⁸⁶ Thetis is not named until near the end of the episode, as one of Neptune's retinue (5.825).

⁸⁷ Nelis (2001), p. 203.

⁸⁸ Coleman (1982), p. 156.

2.7 Somnus and Palinurus

If any episode in the Transitional Section stands out as a candidate for complete demythologization, it is the loss overboard of Palinurus. Yet, once again, not one of the four scholars who have considered the rôle of the gods has discussed this incident. Hardie, however, does discuss this issue in his detailed twelve-page commentary on this passage.⁸⁹ As Hardie points out, Palinurus' exchange with Phorbas (5.843-51) could equally be with the god Somnus in disguise, or the quasi-dream of a man exhausted to the point of falling asleep, or even a conversation with a real human figure, perhaps half-seen through somnolent eyes.

Palinurus' later categorical denial in the Underworld of the involvement of any god in his misfortune (6.348) would tend to support a demythologized rather than (or as well as) a literal reading of the rôle of Somnus as described at 5.838-61, although there is, in any case, no reason why a mere mortal would necessarily be aware of action taken by a god. Such a denial would also seem to imply an acceptance by Palinurus of his own human culpability in having actually fallen asleep (despite being described by the narrator as *insoniti* at 5.841), and is consistent with the sort of guilty confession which might be made by a captain who had failed in his duty when in sole charge of a ship at a time when others were sleeping or resting (5.836-7).⁹⁰ Such an admission would also be consistent both with Palinurus' own comments at 5.848-51 and with Aeneas' valedictory lament (5.870-1), although at least one scholar sees the closing epigram of Book 5 rather as an ironic misunderstanding on the part of Aeneas.⁹¹

In this episode, there is no glaring 'give-away' detail which would render a demythologized interpretation implausible. On the other hand, the apostrophe by the poet (*te, Palinure, petens*: 5.840)⁹² may possibly be taken as something of a pointer towards a more literal interpretation. In any event, this authorial intervention contributes a poetic pathos and beauty which cannot be denied. Viewing the passage as a whole, however, Hardie is undoubtedly correct in pointing out that, like Palinurus and Aeneas, readers are also left to interpret the words in their own way.

⁸⁹ Hardie (1998), Chapter V, pp. 102-14, specifically pp. 112-3.

⁹⁰ Connolly (1945), Epilogue, pp. 95-104, provides a bizarre 'Psychiatrist's confidential report' which purports to show his active rather than passive guilt along with a 'will-to-failure'.

⁹¹ Barchiesi (1979), p. 8: '*Enea interpreta erroneamente la causa della scomparsa di Palinuro*'.

⁹² A beautiful, tragic-lyrical line with five dactyls, a rare metrical pattern in the *Aeneid* (having an incidence of approximately 2 per cent: see discussion in Chapter 4.0 and Appendix).

It should be noted, too, that this episode provides the ‘bridge’ connecting Books 5 and 6 since, as discussed in Chapter 1, the text effectively runs on almost in the manner of an enjambment, without noticeable interruption from Aeneas’ epigram on the loss of Palinurus, to the opening words of Book 6: *sic fatur lacrimans*. The next scene, consisting of only eleven lines (6.3-13), then describes practical aspects of the arrival on the mainland, where the Trojans are seen as busying themselves foraging, and Aeneas sets out to find the Sibyl.

2.8 Narrative treatment

An interesting aspect of these last five scenes of Book 5 is the very different treatment accorded to them as compared with the first two thirds of the book. Two particular features stand out, namely the considerably increased incidence of direct speech, and the almost complete absence of similes.

Of the 268 lines in Book 5 which comprise the first part of the Transitional Section (5.604-871), 105½ lines are taken up by direct speech (mostly dialogue), representing 39 per cent of the total. These figures exclude an additional two and a half lines of virtual speech (5.615-7), where the complaints of the Trojan women are vocalized following the exclamation *heu*. By contrast, in the first 603 lines of Book 5, only 121¹¹/₁₂ lines contain direct speech, representing 20 per cent.⁹³ In the latter part of Book 5, however, there is considerable variation from scene to scene. On the one hand, the foundation of Acesta is a straight description with no speech, whilst the other four scenes vary, with the Palinurus scene being close to the ‘norm’ for the earlier part of the book (20 per cent), and the other scenes having between 35 and 71 per cent.⁹⁴ Not altogether surprisingly, given that the preponderance of ‘ordinary’, as opposed to rhetorical, speech tends to preclude similes, the increased incidence of direct speech is accompanied by a low incidence of similes. In fact, the last third of the book has only

⁹³ Highet (1972), pp. 294-5, for data used to calculate percentages (after rough checking and taking account also of one minor typographical error); pp. 15-18 discuss the definition of speech, and pp. 18-19 set out Highet’s principles of measurement.

⁹⁴ Overall, according to Quinn (1968), p. 323, ‘dialogue makes up more than a third of the poem’. Highet (1972), p. 302, is more precise: direct speech (not necessarily dialogue) occupies 46.75 per cent of the whole, if Books 2 and 3 are treated as direct speech (otherwise, 37.1 per cent). The second part of the Transitional Section is remarkably similar to the first half in terms of the proportion of direct speech content, which is also 39 per cent, but again with variation between the individual scenes.

one very short simile (*ceu fumus in auras*: 5.740), whereas in the first two thirds there are eleven.⁹⁵

Evidently, a considerable variety characterizes the series of short scenes from 5.604 onwards, together with significant differences when compared with the relative homogeneity of the lengthier descriptive narrative employed for the commemorative games. With more direct speech and a swift series of changes of location, during which the reader can also observe the development of important characters, notably Aeneas and Ascanius, this section of the poem displays some of the characteristics of drama. A number of individuals, including minor characters, are given the opportunity to speak and to express differing points of view, thereby appealing directly to the sympathy of the reader, whilst the narratorial voice of the poet, who of course allocates words to other mouths, seems less prominent. Thus, the single perspective of the preceding narrative of the games is replaced by the multiple voices of the immediately following scenes. In these ways, therefore, the last third of Book 5 demonstrates well what Kenneth Quinn describes as ‘the intensely dramatic character of the *Aeneid*’, adducing in support of his view the contribution of tragedy,⁹⁶ as well as structural factors such as the carefully planned composition and the concatenation of numerous episodes which provide for a ‘fast-moving, efficient vitality’.⁹⁷ Writing several years later, Conte sought to deny the dramatic nature of the poem, but as discussed in Chapter 1.0, he fails to convince owing to a rather restricted concept of the essential characteristics of drama.⁹⁸ For readers, the change of narrative style to a series of quasi-dramatic scenes following the games not only provides variety, but within a short span brings their minds back to the ‘big picture’, the principal themes of the poem as a whole, in preparation for the more solemn and didactic climax of the first half of the epic.

⁹⁵ Wilkins (1921) lists fifteen similes in Book 5, counting one double simile as two, and counting two comparisons which may not strictly be similes. Rieks (1981), p. 1094, lists ten ‘ausgeführte Gleichnisse’. Briggs (1992), pp. 158, 160, lists the same ten similes as Rieks, consciously disregarding the one at 5.317 (*effusi nimbo similes*) and failing to note the one already cited at 5.740 (*ceu fumus*). In notes 10 and 11 on p. 164, Briggs also provides useful statistics concerning the number of similes in each book and ratios of numbers of lines devoted to similes as compared with the text as a whole. He points out that Book 5 has more similes than any other book in the first half of the poem.

⁹⁶ Quinn (1968), p. 323.

⁹⁷ Quinn (1968), p. 74, where he also states: ‘it is tempting, and in many ways appropriate, to call Virgil’s technique dramatic’; elsewhere (p. 71) in discussing the sub-division of books, he suggests that the poem encapsulates 167 ‘episodes’.

⁹⁸ Conte (1986), pp. 158-71.

2.9 Conclusion

In looking at the last third of Book 5, my primary focus has been on the rôle of the gods, but several other themes have been noted in the course of discussion. Accordingly, in this conclusion, I shall address the thematic elements in the same order.

As concerns the rôle of the gods in this first part of the Transitional Section of the *Aeneid*, it is clear, even on the basis of the small sample of four scenes, that applying any particular one of the theories discussed to the events which take place falls short of a really adequate interpretation. Looking at the last third of Book 5 as a single unit, some support can be found for each of the four theories concerning the rôle of the gods in the *Aeneid*. Feeney's view cannot be refuted, posited as it is upon a literal interpretation of the text enhanced with allegorical overtones. He provides a salutary reaction against Williams' monochrome and sometimes forced demythologized readings which undermine the status of the long-term teleology of the poem, namely that the destiny of the Roman people and of the Julian clan was divinely ordained. Yet, incidents such as Iris' initial incitement of the Trojan women, or the loss of Palinurus, cry out for at least a partial rational interpretation in parallel, posited on human psychology. Moreover, the advice attributed by Aeneas to Anchises can easily be construed as the product of the internal workings of a mind temporarily disorientated through shock, or as a vision/dream, or both. It is also true that, as Coleman argues, additional status is accorded to characters and events when gods play a part in the narrative. At the same time, however, Coleman fails to convince when he asserts that divine interventions are needed to boost weak or lacking human motivation. In the last third of Book 5, a rational explanation is not lacking for the events which take place on the human stage. On the other hand, Lyne's idea is much more attractive, namely that the gods do not generate human psychological states which do not already exist within the characters, but work with them and increase them in degree. Taken on its own, therefore, Feeney's view is insufficient for the rich complexity of the narrative, which can be interpreted on more than one level, since most of the scenes involving the gods or the supernatural in the last third of Book 5 admit of more than one interpretative approach. On the other hand, a selective amalgam of all four views enriches the reading experience.

Just as the gods return in the last third of Book 5 following a period of quiescence, several other thematic elements also rise again to the surface. Most noticeably, one of

the ‘other voices’ of the *Aeneid*, as perceived by Parry and others,⁹⁹ is allowed to be heard at full volume. In the burning of the boats, a brief but serious challenge arises which presents an alternative view of the possible future of the Trojan exiles, and thereby poses a potential threat to the achievement of Aeneas’ mission. Had that alternative view prevailed, then there could have been no Rome. Two aspects of this challenge stand out particularly. Firstly, the challenge is launched by a repressed constituency which expresses itself only on rare occasions in the poem, that is, the Trojan women, who have been left unsupervised at a time of heightened emotions. Secondly, and even more extraordinarily, the challenge has a degree of success for the women, albeit a success which carries practical benefits for the mission in the sense that it is able to continue unencumbered by ‘negative elements’, and that Aeneas is relieved of the invidious task of deciding who should continue the voyage in the reduced number of ships. Whether the women’s action is regarded as a qualified success, or as a sort of failure, or as a blessing in disguise, the point made about the suffering of the women and weaker members of the group of Trojan exiles is communicated extremely strongly. Moreover, the episode links not only to the incidents relating to maternal feelings, with Euryalus’ mother and with Creusa, but to other places in the poem where the price of the imperial project in terms of human death and suffering more generally is starkly visible.

A related episode is the loss of Palinurus. In the whole of Book 5 up to the last forty lines, no human death has taken place. When suddenly Palinurus is lost, presumed dead, the reader is forcefully reminded of human mortality and, at the same time, of the arbitrariness of human misfortunes. Despite the symbolic significance of this episode, the deep sadness of this otherwise pointless death is powerfully evoked. Palinurus is not even killed in fighting to establish a new home for himself and his co-exiles, yet he has endured the hardships of the journeys and has been instrumental in providing navigational leadership for the fleet. Again, the loss of this one man offers another glimpse of the tragic cost of the project.

In often quasi-dramatic form, the five scenes which follow the games also show the continuing metamorphosis of Aeneas as a leader. He has demonstrated the recovery of his *pietas* in honouring his father and in his general conduct during the commemorative games. Once he has overcome his crisis of confidence, therefore, he moves further towards the stature required of a Roman general. With his resolve

⁹⁹ Parry (1963); Lyne (1987); Fowler (1990) [= Fowler (2000), pp. 40-63].

fortified, Aeneas is thus prepared psychologically for the wars to come in the second half of the *Aeneid*, and ready for the revelations in the Underworld. Aeneas is also seen with his father, who provides critical moral encouragement, and alongside his son, who, as he develops towards manhood, shows the first signs of the leadership qualities needed to secure the succession. These father-son relationships in action reflect the wider importance of such relationships in the poem as a whole.

The episodes discussed in this chapter link together coherently in a fashion resembling the scenes of a drama. Through a significant change of mood and of narrative style, which contrasts with the portrayal of the commemorative games, these scenes also bring back to centre stage the major gods and important themes which link backwards and forwards throughout the poem. Overall, the last third of Book 5 makes an important contribution to the poem as a whole. Not only does the main plot restart in earnest following the lengthy episodes of the sojourn at Carthage and the commemorative games, but readers are reminded of important thematic threads which pervade the poem. Furthermore, through the Palinurus episode the end of Book 5 connects seamlessly to Book 6. Hence, the five scenes which conclude Book 5 form an integral part of the narrative progression towards the descent to the Underworld.

3. The ‘sacrifice’ of Palinurus

Michael Putnam’s extended commentary on Book 5 of the *Aeneid*, in his monograph entitled *The poetry of the Aeneid*, has been often cited and is very influential.¹ He provides a masterly and sensitive analysis of the commemorative games held for Anchises at Drepanum and the attendant menace of reality,² which lurks beneath the surface of the only book of the *Aeneid* in which the Trojans are portrayed as enjoying themselves (*laeto ... coetu*, 5.107).³ Within this analysis, Palinurus is represented as a particularly important character,⁴ since he figures significantly both at the beginning of the book (5.12-25), where owing to adverse weather conditions he easily obtains Aeneas’ agreement to change course and seek shelter at Drepanum, as well as at the end of the book (5.833-60), where he plunges headlong into the sea. In Putnam’s analysis, the loss and death of Palinurus are repeatedly described as a ‘sacrifice’, and in the literature since 1965 I have been struck by the number of times the loss and death of Aeneas’ helmsman are referred to with the same, or closely related, terminology.⁵

Putnam was not the first, however, to have deemed Palinurus’ death to be a sacrifice, although the idea does not appear to have been developed at any significant length before the mid-1960s.⁶ Richard Heinze, for example, applies the word *Opfer* to Palinurus only in a footnote, while W F Jackson Knight only refers to Palinurus as a sacrifice briefly, when speaking of him and Misenus in the context of a discussion of

¹ Putnam (1965), Chapter 2, pp. 64-104, and (notes) 211-19.

² Most pertinent in the present context is the darkly comic incident in which Menoetes is thrown overboard by Gyas, foreshadowing the tragic reality of Palinurus’ fate.

³ Heinze (1915), p. 170; Heinze (1993), p. 136; Miniconi (1962), p. 565: ‘Le rire n’ est la marque de joie que dans le livre V, le plus gai de tout le poème’; Holt (1979/80), p. 115: ‘*laetus* is a key word of the book’.

⁴ The name ‘Palinurus’ appears 85 times in the 41 pages of the main text (excluding the notes).

⁵ By way of example, but no doubt not an exhaustive list: Zarker (1967), p. 220; della Corte (1972), p. 103; Williams, R D (1972), p. 470, note to 6.156; Ambrose (1980), p. 451; Harrison, E L (1980), p. 372; Bandera (1981); Brenk (1984); Fitzgerald (1984), pp. 52, 62 n. 3; McKay (1984), pp. 124-7, but also using the term ‘quasi-sacrificial’, pp. 123, 137; Augello (1987), p. 412; Lossau in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* III (1987), p. 937, s.v. ‘Palinuro’; Nicoll (1988), p. 459; Brenk (1988); O’ Hara (1990), pp. 23, 107, 110; Lee (1992), p. 87; Hardie (1993), pp. 11, 19, 32-3; Quint (1993), pp. 11, 86-93; Hejduk (1996), p. 283 and n. 25; Farrell (1999), p. 107; Smith, R M (1999), p. 520; Keith (2000), p. 48; Hejduk (2001), p. 74-5; Nelis (2001), p. 223; Dinter (2005), p. 158; Smith, R A (2005), pp. 34, 36; O’ Hara in *The Virgil encyclopedia* II (2014), p. 959, s.v. ‘Palinurus’; Fratantuono (2015).

⁶ Farrell (2008), p. 9, credits Putnam with having brought Palinurus to prominence in Vergilian criticism.

Vergil's 'tendency to ... duplication'.⁷ Writing only a little earlier than Putnam, Brooks Otis does not accord to Palinurus anything approaching the same degree of prominence as Putnam gives him. Otis does, however, refer to Palinurus as a sacrifice, both in place of Aeneas and more generally for all the Trojans.⁸ Additionally, in the latter sense of 'the *one* who dies for the *many*', Otis speaks of 'the law of patriotic devotion', apparently thereby intimating the possibility of *devotio*, the particular Roman variant manifestation of sacrifice, which requires an act of self-dedication on the part of the victim. More or less contemporaneously with Putnam, Charles Segal also speaks of Palinurus as being a sacrifice.⁹

Since the appearance of Putnam's analysis, articles or books which focus specifically on Palinurus have tended to deal with topographical aetiology,¹⁰ or on how to reconcile (or not) the versions of Palinurus' story given at 5.827-71 and 6.337-83.¹¹ Nevertheless, a number of scholars have taken up the theme of sacrifice in wider-ranging discussions of 'sacrificial deaths' in the *Aeneid* and other epics, and have included Palinurus within those broader contexts. Various relevant works published since 1965 will be cited in the following pages, but two appear to have been particularly influential, and have extended the definitional scope of 'sacrifice'. Both Cesáreo Bandera and Philip Hardie devote space to consideration of the Palinurus episode, although, curiously, the former does not make any reference to Putnam, despite having written some sixteen years later.¹² These two scholars have both brought into their discussions René Girard's theory concerning 'sacrificial crisis', which was first mooted in 1972, and, along with that, the designation of Palinurus also as a 'scapegoat'.¹³ As with the term 'sacrifice', the designation of 'scapegoat' applied to Palinurus is not entirely new, having been used previously by the Irish scholar, Henry, and others.¹⁴

Yet none of the three terms identified above – namely 'sacrifice', '*devotio*', and 'scapegoat' (or slightly less often, the Greek equivalent, φαρμακός) – seems to me entirely appropriate. In order, therefore, to get behind the frequent use of such terminology, I intend (i) firstly, to examine the way in which sacrifice (excluding

⁷ Heinze (1903), p. 440, n. 1; Heinze (1915), p. 452 n. 1; Knight (1944), p. 291, (1966), p. 353.

⁸ Otis (1964), p. 281.

⁹ Segal (1965), p. 622.

¹⁰ Capo Palinuro is located near the southern extreme of the modern Italian region of Campania: McKay (1967); Clark (1977a), pp. 65, 69; McKay (1984).

¹¹ Horsfall (1991), pp. 100-2; Horsfall (2013), pp. 274-6; Horsfall (2016), pp. 90-2; previous discussions of the discrepancies between the versions include: Jacob (1952), p. 163; Williams (1960), pp. xxv-xxviii.

¹² Bandera (1981); Hardie (1993).

¹³ Girard (1972/77); Girard (1982/86).

¹⁴ Henry (1889), p. 199, on *Aeneid* 5.815; della Corte (1972), pp. 103-4; Williams (1972), p. 451, note on 5.814-5.

routine libation) is normally portrayed throughout the *Aeneid*, and whether instances of the special variant, *devotio*, are to be found (ii) secondly to consider whether any scapegoat or *pharmakós* can be identified, and (iii) thirdly, to look at what is more generally understood by sacrifice, not just in classical literature and scholarship, but also from the wider anthropological and psychological perspectives, as well as in journalistic and popular usage. Following these three discussions, I plan to consider the issues raised by the loss and death of Palinurus with a view to attempting to understand better Vergil's representation of these episodes and their significance within the Transitional Section of the *Aeneid*. Finally, I propose to assess the suitability of the term 'sacrifice' for the death of Palinurus on the basis the findings of the foregoing discussions.

3.1 Sacrifice and its variants in the *Aeneid*

Religious observance is represented with remarkable frequency in the *Aeneid*, emphasizing not only the importance of Aeneas' individual piety within the immediate time-frame of the poem, but also the concomitant importance of the collective piety underpinning the *pax deorum* (which was believed by many Romans to sustain the empire) in the indefinite long-term future, beyond the end of the poem. An appendix at the end of an article by Israel Shatzman, provides a convenient, classified listing of religious rites found in Vergil's writings (categorized as prayers, sacrifices and libations, oaths, vows, funerary or commemorative rites, oracles, state rites, purifications, magic rites, and '*varia*').¹⁵

Overall, components of sacrificial ritual which are enacted, or for which instructions are given, are described in a total of 29 passages in the *Aeneid*, albeit sometimes only somewhat cursorily. An analysis of these 29 passages is provided in Table 3, on the following two pages.

¹⁵ Shatzman (1974), pp. 62-3. Unfortunately, so far as sacrifices are concerned, Shatzman's checklist is incomplete owing to a typographical error: within the listing on p. 62 relating to libations and sacrifices in Book 3: '231- 354' should read '231, 278-80, 300-05, 353-4'

Table 3, Page 1

Owing to problems with footnotes, in the electronic version Table 3 (Landscape) has had to be located after the Bibliography at the end of this thesis.

Table 3, Page 2

Owing to problems with footnotes, in the electronic version Table 3 (Landscape) has had to be located after the Bibliography at the end of this thesis.

Worth noting is that passages describing components of sacrifice are distributed across the whole of the *Aeneid*, but with an almost two-thirds preponderance in the first half of the poem (19 instances out of 29), corresponding to the formative period of Aeneas as he undergoes the metamorphosis from a Trojan warrior to a Roman leader. Of some note also is that while major characters such as Aeneas and Dido do themselves perform or make arrangements for sacrifices, Vergil also sometimes gives the tasks of preparing, carrying out, or giving instructions about sacrifice to characters whose appearances, although having significance within the immediate context, are few, or limited to only one of the twelve books. Hence sacrifices play a significant part in episodes featuring Sinon, Laocoön, Helenus, the Sibyl, and Latinus. Even when the principal celebrant is another character, however, Aeneas is present on the majority of occasions (21 out of 29), the most obvious exceptions, naturally, being the mendacious (but nevertheless convincing) description of arrangements for the sacrifice of Sinon, the sacrifices carried out by Gaetulian Iarbas, and Dido's deceptive preparations.

The importance of Aeneas' participation, whenever it was possible for him to be present, is especially highlighted by the fact that Book 9, the only book in which Aeneas does not feature, is also the only book in which no sacrifice is performed. Inclusion of Haemonides in the list of sacrifices in Table 3 is justified since, like Anius in Book 3, he appears in full regalia, following, probably, completion of a recent sacrifice. In an inversion of normal practice, however, the sacrificer is himself sacrificed. On the other hand the eight youths captured for slaughter at Pallas' funeral and the 'immolation' of Turnus are excluded on the grounds that no elements of ritual dress or practice are narrated in connexion with these deaths. The nature of these deaths is, however, discussed later in this chapter. Also excluded is the slaughter of Aulestes (12.289-97), since despite the proximity of an altar on to which he is thrown headlong (12.292: *aris*) no other circumstance suggests that this death can be considered formally sacrificial. Reference to him as *victima divis* (12.296) comes not from the narrator, but is placed in the mouth of the triumphant Messapus, and cannot therefore be considered authoritative.

When contrasted with the Homeric epics, the high incidence of descriptions of components of sacrificial rites in the *Aeneid* is particularly noticeable. For example, in the *Iliad* ritual actions of sacrifice are described in only seven passages in the twenty-

four books.¹⁶ Of these passages, only four consist of more than five lines and offer a certain amount of detail. All of these four passages appear in the first third of the poem, before the books in which most of the heavy fighting takes place. As will be discussed below, Geoffrey Kirk has analysed three of these four scenes and tabulated the components, thereby demonstrating a ‘certain obvious consistency’ in the Homeric epics, largely owing to the formulaic language of recurrent scenes.¹⁷ The fourth passage, however, which Kirk cites as *Iliad* 7.316-23, was excluded from his analysis on the grounds that it is not a sacrifice, but the immediately preceding lines (7.314-5) demonstrate that the slaughtered bull was indeed a sacrifice for Zeus (βοῦν ἱέρειυσεν ... | ... Κρονίῳνι).¹⁸ Moreover, the detail provided is entirely consistent with the other three instances which Kirk analyses. In the *Odyssey*, again only seven passages describe components of sacrificial ritual with some degree of detail.¹⁹ All except one of these occur before Odysseus’ return to Ithaca. Of these seven passages, Kirk also analyses three, understandably excluding the special procedure prescribed by Circe at the end of Book 10 for Odysseus’ visit to Hades in Book 11.

Bearing in mind the much lower incidence of descriptions of sacrificial procedure in the Homeric epics, it is clear that in the *Aeneid* the institution of sacrifice (not to mention additional libations and prayers, which also occur from time to time outside the context of sacrifice) constitutes part of the religious infrastructure which supports the character of Aeneas and the divinely ordained nature of his mission. Aside from the frequency of mentions of sacrifices, Vergil also places great weight on the exactness of his sacrificial rituals, as Eduard Norden comments in his note on 6.38.²⁰ Nicholas Horsfall also remarks upon Vergil’s predilection for the precise, technical, and specialized use of words.²¹ Qualifying Norden’s statement, however, Shatzman observes that, whilst Vergil does indeed provide readers with a considerable amount of detail, he is eclectic in his description of rites, using the technical vocabulary, but omitting whole stages or processes at times.²² It is, indeed, true that Vergil is impressionistic, and does not describe any one sacrifice in full detail,²³ whether because

¹⁶ Lines following *Iliad* 1.314, **1.447**, **2.402**, **3.267**, 7.313, 10.292, 19.266. Bold type indicates passages analysed in Kirk (1981) (see below).

¹⁷ Kirk (1981), pp. 62-8.

¹⁸ Kirk (1981), p. 63 n. 1.

¹⁹ Lines following *Odyssey* **3.5**, **3.429**, 9.550, 11.23, 12.353, 13.24, **14.418**. Bold type indicates analysed in Kirk (1981).

²⁰ Norden (1927), p. 132: ‘... legt Vergil großes Gewicht auf Genauigkeit des Opferrituals’.

²¹ Horsfall (1991), p. 22.

²² Shatzman (1974), pp. 51-2.

²³ Hence, Fratantuono (2015), p. 130 n. 3, comments: ‘There is surprisingly little actual sacrifice in the *Aeneid*.’

he may have considered such a description not *fas*, or perhaps rather because he wanted to stimulate readers to draw upon their own contemporary Roman experiences to fill out the detail, thereby strengthening perceptions of a close relationship between the Trojan past and Roman present. Either way, it is true that religious rites are often merely sketched in for the purpose of creating appropriate atmosphere by way of backdrop against which actions take place and characters are portrayed. As Shatzman aptly points out: ‘... the religious aspect of the rites is subordinate to the literary aims of the poet’.²⁴ When aggregated, however, the dispersed details offer a reasonably full and consistent picture of sacrificial practice.

Another useful initial reference point for an examination of Vergil’s portrayal of sacrifice in the *Aeneid* is Justus Holstein’s compilation of rites and ritual acts extracted from Servius’ commentaries, which was submitted to New York University as a doctoral dissertation in 1915.²⁵ Holstein is particularly helpful in that he provides a definition of sacrifice which should be kept in mind for the present investigation. Thus, the ritual act of *sacrificium* is defined as ‘any voluntary gift offered to a deity, whereby one acknowledges dependence and hopes to render the deity propitious’ (p. 13). Noting also that Servius provides very little information concerning what Holstein terms ‘unbloody sacrifices’, he effectively draws attention to the relative absence in the *Aeneid* of the ritual offering of cakes or vegetables. Sacrifice in the *Aeneid*, therefore, for the most part, involves the ritual slaughter of one or more animals, which normally means a bovine, ovine or porcine offering (or combination thereof), with only rare and special instances of the ritual sacrifice of human beings, which will be discussed below.

As already indicated, of the numerous passages identified, not one depicts the processes of sacrifice completely from beginning to end. Three passages, discussed individually below, provide rather more information than others, namely (i) the sacrifices performed by Aeneas before the commemorative games for Anchises in Book 5, which include a double *suovetaurilia*, (ii) the sacrifices performed by Deiphobe, the Sibyl, before the descent into the Underworld in Book 6, and (iii) the sacrifices performed in front of Aeneas, Latinus and Turnus with the intention of sealing the subsequently frustrated treaty in Book 12. When the elements extracted from these three passages are collated (see Table 4, below), there are sufficient common elements to make it possible to construct a reasonably good idea of what may be considered to constitute ‘normal’ sacrificial practice in the *Aeneid*. Evidence from numerous minor

²⁴ Shatzman (1974), p. 57.

²⁵ Holstein (1916).

passages corroborates this picture by portraying one or more of the principal elements. First, however, it is necessary to look at the three major instances of ritual sacrifice.

(i) *Book 5*. When the sacrifice is carried out prior to the games at Drepanum (5.72-83, 94-103), Aeneas is the principal celebrant. He is also one of the many present who may have been expected to derive some religious benefit from the sacrifice, and who are designated as ‘sacrifiers’ according to terminology used by the pioneer sociologists Henri Hubert and Marcel Mauss.²⁶ Aeneas and others, having bedecked their heads with garlands of myrtle, firstly perform a libation, which Vergil, as narrator, qualifies as *rite* (5.77). From somewhere, bowls of sacred blood appear (5.78), implying that at least one animal has been slaughtered even before the main ceremony, which is described after a prayer to the spirit of Anchises and an interruption occasioned by the snake omen (5.80-93). The most solemn part of the ceremony which now takes place is evidently a double (*binas*, 5.96) *suovetaurilia*, described here by Vergil as carried out *de more* (5.96). A further libation follows. After placing gifts on the altar, more beasts are slain, although the act of slaughter is not itself described. The flesh is then roasted on spits (*veribus*, 5.103), presumably for a communal feast which is also not described.

(ii) *Book 6*. Before the κατάβασις, the Sibyl, in her capacity as priestess, is principal celebrant of the sacrifice, with Aeneas as sole sacrificer (6.243-54). Here, wine is first poured over the heads of the black bulls and hairs plucked from their heads and placed on the altar fires. After the relevant gods have been invoked, the throats of the beasts are slit, and the blood collected. Aeneas himself then personally slays with a sword a sheep and a barren cow, and inaugurates altars to Dis. Finally, the flesh and entrails are committed to the flames to be entirely incinerated.²⁷

(iii) *Book 12*. Sacrificial ritual also attends the intended solemnization of the treaty to give effect to a truce in the last book of the poem (12.116-20, 166-74, 212-15). Description of the sacrificial proceedings is interrupted twice, firstly by the conversation between Juno and Juturna (12.134-61), and then by the invocations and oaths pronounced by Aeneas and Latinus. In the first section, the Latins and the Trojans

²⁶ Hubert & Mauss (1899), p. 11: ‘Nous appelons sacrifiant le sujet qui recueille ainsi les bénéfices du sacrifice ou en subit les effets’. In Halls’ 1964 English translation, p. 10, the French word ‘sacrifiant’ is translated as ‘sacrifier’, although this word is not to be found with this specialist meaning in *OED2E*.

²⁷ Servius on 6.253 explains that this is a holocaust sacrifice; Hubert & Mauss (1899), p. 38 n. 238, indicates that sacrifice involving destruction of the body was often performed for the infernal deities.

prepare altars and fires, some of them clad in ritual aprons (*limo*, 12.120) and wreathed in sacred foliage. Subsequently, a priest in pure robes brings in the offspring of a boar and an unshorn sheep, and goes with them towards the altar. Salted grain is then thrown or sprinkled, and some hair is removed from the victims with a knife, while libations are poured over the altar. In the third part of the description, the cattle are slaughtered *rite* (12.213) over or near the altar flames, and the flesh removed and piled on the altars on trays, although for what purpose is not vouchsafed. It seems likely that a communal feast was planned, but that the plans were abandoned when the truce was violated.

When the component elements of sacrificial rites identified in the three passages discussed above are collated in a table similar to that presented by Kirk for the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* during the August 1980 Fondation Hardt *entretiens* on the subject of sacrifice in antiquity, a good picture can be constructed of what may be considered to be ‘normal’ in the *Aeneid*.²⁸ In Table 4, below, evidence is also adduced from some of the numerous other references to components of sacrificial ceremonial found in the poem. These additional mentions confirm and support the composite picture of practices deemed to constitute the norm as portrayed throughout the poem. Although each such vignette is incomplete, there are sufficient recurrent details to show that they are all part of a single coherent view of sacrificial practice. Noted in the table is also how often practices are described by the narrator as *rite* or *de more*, suggesting that Vergil wished to highlight the ‘orthodoxy’ of what may be considered ‘proto-Roman’ rites portrayed in his epic. Some of the slight variations which can be perceived may be attributed to the different purposes served by the sacrifices analysed, especially the one presided over by the Sibyl, which was undertaken to propitiate the gods of the Underworld.

²⁸ Kirk (1981), p. 64.

Table 4: Component elements of sacrificial rites in the <i>Aeneid</i>				
Ritual elements	'Major' scenes:			Selected other occurrences (first line only cited)
	Book 5	Book 6	Book 12	
Invocation/prayer	Y	Y	Y	
Priestly/regal celebrant	Y	Y	Y	Laocoön 2.201, Helenus 3.369
Witness/audience	Y	Y	Y	<i>passim</i>
Altars	Y	Y	Y	<i>passim</i>
'Willing' victim(s)	(Y)	(Y)	(Y)	Implied by absence of disruption
Animal(s) slaughtered	Y	Y	Y	<i>passim</i>
Fire(s)	Y	Y	Y	Iarbas 4.200, Euander 8.542
Libation	Y	?	Y	Aeneas 5.776
Blood collected	Y	Y		
Communal feast	Y		(Y)	
Roasting/burning	Y		Y	
Garlands/wreaths	Y		Y	Laurel 3.80, Olive 5.774
Victims' hairs plucked		Y	Y	
Special robes/dress			Y	Haemonides 10.538
Salted meal			Y	Sinon 2.132
Fillet/headband				Laocoön 2.221, Helenus 3.369
Head veiled				Helenus 3.404, 3.545
<i>rite / de more</i>	5.77 5.96		12.213	<i>rite</i> : 3.546, 4.638, 7.93; <i>de more</i> : 3.369, 4.57, 8.544.

Looking particularly at the components common to all three major instances of sacrifice analysed in Table 4, above, as well as to other instances, we can postulate the elements of procedure which are *sine qua non* for ritual sacrifice in the *Aeneid*, namely: a qualified human celebrant who invokes a god and then slaughters one or more willing

animal victims in front of at least one witness, at or on an altar where at least one fire is burning. On this basis, therefore, it seems reasonable to suggest that a Roman of the Augustan era, bearing in mind the distance of roughly one thousand years, would accept these elements as essentially *rite*.

When speaking of *devotio* (which is discussed further below), Matthew Leigh expresses concern over a ‘constant narrowing down of the terms of reference’, whilst Robert Cowan, similarly warns against too much reliance on a narrow conception of orthopraxy.²⁹ The same should, of course, be true of sacrifice. Yet, despite Vergil’s description of several of the sacrifices as *rite* or *de more*, Julia Hejduk takes the view, drawing on Servius and Macrobius,³⁰ that ‘Aeneas frequently does not perform them [i.e. sacrifices] correctly’.³¹ Moreover, according to Hejduk, Aeneas’ failure to carry out sacrifices correctly meant that the anger of the gods (especially of Juno) was not placated, resulting in unfavourable portents and ‘potentially dangerous consequences’, which would continue until such time as deficient sacrifices were rectified by subsequent, correctly performed sacrifices.

Although in the late Republic and early Empire, sacrifices were expected to be carried out punctiliously, and had to be repeated in the event of lapses of procedure, Hejduk’s thesis is difficult to accept for several reasons.³² First of all, as indicated above, the rites portrayed in the *Aeneid* need to be considered as ‘proto-Roman’. Clearly, during the seven years or so after the fall of Troy, the rites performed by Aeneas will still have been strongly influenced by Trojan practices. Indeed, it would be wholly inappropriate to judge rites described as being performed in the twelfth century BCE according to the religious criteria of the first century BCE. Room for evolution over time is needed, even though relatively little evolution is evidently required. Hence, according to Deryck Williams and Horsfall, the aetiology for veiling the head during sacrifice, in accordance with Helenus’ instructions (3.403-7), which Aeneas does for the first time at *Castrum Minervae* (but apparently not subsequently in the poem).³³ Secondly, it should also be remembered that during the sacrifice before the descent to the Underworld, the Sibyl is present throughout. Given her somewhat abrupt and

²⁹ Leigh (1993), p. 91; Cowan (2011), p. 57.

³⁰ Servius on 3.21 and 3.279; Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, 3.10.

³¹ Hejduk (2001), pp. 13, 30.

³² Horsfall (2016) dismisses Hejduk’s arguments as ‘hardly ... orthodox scholarly discussion’ (p. 8 n. 28) and ‘consistently misconceived’ (p. 149 n. 19).

³³ Williams (1972), p. 303, note to 3.405; Horsfall (2006), p. 158, note to 3.174, p. 307, note to 3.407; cf. also, Perkell (2010), p. 69, note to 3.405, where a variant aetiology is given, citing *Origo gentis romanae*, 12.2. ‘Aeneas making sacrifice’ is represented as veiled on the *Ara Pacis* (Elsner (1991), Plate II).

imperious manner, it is inconceivable that she would allow Aeneas to get away with incorrect conduct during the sacrifice. Thirdly, it also seems improbable that *pious* Aeneas would carry out a series of defective sacrifices. Vergil's designations of *rite* and *de more* were undoubtedly to the point, and it seems highly likely that an intelligent Roman of the Augustan age (as opposed to literary critics of the late fourth and early fifth centuries CE) would have recognized as attributable to legacy influences any perceived imperfections in the fore-runners of the *ritus Romanus*.

As shown in the table and as has already been noted above, several second-level characters (as well as Dido) engage in or speak about sacrificial ritual. Such mentions are usually brief, just enough to evoke atmosphere relying on the reader's familiarity with Roman and Greek practices. Some of these less than full descriptions of sacrifice are nevertheless worthy of comment. Mentions in Books 2 and 3, in particular, should perhaps be approached with some caution, since they are part of the internal narration by Aeneas, and within that sometimes attributed to another character. Nevertheless, there is no reason to suspect significant distortion. When Aeneas is reporting Sinon's fabricated story, the detail concerning the sacrificial preparations needs to be convincing from Sinon's perspective, whilst on Aeneas' part there is an element of interest to show that the Trojans were not deceived without good reason. Even if these considerations led to some exaggeration, that does not detract from the basic accuracy of the detail. Similarly, there are no grounds for believing that Aeneas' account of Helenus' injunctions regarding sacrifice is inaccurate. Indeed, although still narrated by Aeneas, Helenus' instructions are subsequently carried out when the Trojans land at *Castrum Minervae*.

As a special variant of sacrifice, *devotio* has been best described by Livy.³⁴ The essential points, according to Livy, are self-selection and ceremonial dedication to the gods of the Underworld for the benefit of the nation as a whole, followed by an attack upon the densest part of the enemy which is intended to be almost certainly suicidal. Setting aside for the moment the *Palinurus* incident, which, Otis hints, may be a possible instance of *devotio* (incorrectly, as I shall argue below), the possible examples in the *Aeneid* are limited to two.³⁵ Only in Book 12 are these examples to be found. Having opted for single combat, Turnus demands formalization of his decision by way of ceremonial (*fer sacra*: 12.13), and after the sacrifices (discussed above) he states

³⁴ Livy, 8.9.1 ff, 10.28.12 ff; cf. also Versnel (1981), pp. 137-63.

³⁵ Cowan (2011), p. 66, rightly points out that Aeneas' rush '*in media arma*' at 2.353 cannot properly be classed as *devotio* because it could not have saved Troy.

explicitly that he is fighting for the Rutulian and Latin peoples (*unum / pro vobis*: 12.694-5).³⁶ Arguably, following the sacrifices Aeneas and Turnus are in the identical situation of being *devoti*, each for his own people. Even though the combat is to be fought one-to-one, not a headlong dash into the midst of an opposing army, death must be expected to be certain for one of the *devoti*. Another interpretation which has some metaphorical similarity with *devotio*, has been offered by David Quint, although he does not use that specific term. He speaks of Aeneas' self-sacrifice in repressing his own individuality, suggesting that the loss of Palinurus forms part of a progressive stripping away of Aeneas' personal ties and identity, following the losses of Creusa, Anchises and Dido.³⁷ This is an insightful interpretation, but the 'sacrifice' is of Aeneas, and is not applicable to the death of Palinurus.

The third variant of sacrifice mentioned in connexion with Palinurus is the practice of expelling an individual (the pharmakós or scapegoat) from a city or country, possibly, but not always certainly, to die in a hostile environment. Although such a practice was not Roman, it would have been known to Vergil through Greek tradition or myth (or, possibly also, from Jewish sources).³⁸ The archetype of the scapegoat is, of course, to be found in *Leviticus* (16.8), but it is surely better to focus principally upon the Greek tradition of the pharmakós in order to avoid inappropriate Judaeo-Christian connotations, such as introduced by Henry.³⁹ In essence, the pharmakós or scapegoat is seen as saving a community by bearing the burden of sin or of pollution believed to be the source of some affliction, such as plague or natural disaster, suffered by the wider population. Most accounts indicate that, after sometimes quite elaborate preparations and due ceremony, the pharmakós is simply abandoned to fend for himself (so, not necessarily to die), although some legendary or mythical versions of the practice state that the pharmakós was killed.⁴⁰

If we now look at vocabulary, it is particularly interesting to note that Vergil does not use the word '*immolare*' for animal sacrifices, the commonest words being '*mactare*' and '*caedere*'. Yet the term '*immolare*' would be an entirely appropriate term for 'normal' sacrifices, since the word is derived etymologically from '*mola [salsa]*', the salted meal sprinkled over the victim (which features twice in the poem, at

³⁶ Cf. also 11.440-2: ... *animam hanc ... Turnus ego ... devovi*; also Galinsky (1988), p. 324.

³⁷ Quint (1993), p. 84.

³⁸ Horsfall (2012): 'evidence that there had been cultural contact between the Jewish and Roman literary traditions is very strong'; Bremmer (2013) concurs, disagreeing only about particular detail.

³⁹ Henry (1889), p. 199, quoting the gospel: *John*, 11.49-50.

⁴⁰ See Bremmer (1983), pp. 315-8, for a discussion of accounts of the death of the pharmakós, concluding on p. 317 that: 'our conclusion must be that the pharmakos stayed alive'.

2.133 and 12.173, as '*fruges salsae*'). In the *Aeneid*, Vergil reserves '*immolare*' for human victims, using it three times only in the whole poem, specifically in relation to the eight youths (10.517-20) doomed to be killed at Pallas' funeral, then to the priest Haemonides (10.540-2), and finally to Turnus (12.949).⁴¹ Evidently, Vergil has deliberately chosen to represent these killings as sacrifices, two in the course of battle and one 'off-stage' at a funeral, so this special usage needs to be examined. In each case, a dedicatee is explicit, namely the spirit of Pallas (twice) and [Mars] Gradivus. On the face of it, therefore, these immolations would appear to be offerings to honour and propitiate the dedicatees, although the case of the youths would more aptly be described as ritual killings by way of vengeance, as defined by Dennis Hughes.⁴² The case of Turnus is, of course, more complex and has been much debated. For the present purpose, however, it is enough to note that Vergil evidently represented it as a form of sacrifice, in which the death of Turnus is presumably to be interpreted not only as revenge, but also as a sacrificial offering for the immediate short-term (and, symbolically, also the long-term) security of the Roman people.

Hubert and Mauss make the observation that documents relating to Greek and Roman sacrifices are not as good as those for some other cultures.⁴³ Theoretically, at any rate, most of the rites described ought to be other than Roman. Sacrifices by Trojans, Phoenicians, and even by Gaetulian Iarbas are mentioned in the text, but there is virtually no differentiation. Commentators and scholars observe that the rites in the *Aeneid* are essentially Roman with an admixture of Greek practices, such as not veiling the head and plucking or cutting bristles from the head of the victim. Because of the relative uniformity of ceremonial, however, Vergil is able to rely on relatively few details to stimulate readers' knowledge of such practices. Other sources also testify that these 'normal' practices are largely Roman. Indeed, the components of sacrifice set out in Table 4 above correspond closely with the main stages of sacrifice described by Mary Beard, John North and Simon Price.⁴⁴ Furthermore, the aggregated picture derived from the elements dispersed throughout the poem is also entirely consistent with scenes depicted in Roman sculptural art (notably the so-called altar of Domitius Ahenobarbus of the second century BCE,⁴⁵ as well as the post-Vergilian *Ara Pacis*).

⁴¹ Panoussi (2010), pp. 62-3.

⁴² Hughes (1991), Chapter 1, pp. 1-12.

⁴³ Hubert & Mauss (1899), p. 7.

⁴⁴ Beard, *et al.* (1998), p. 36-7; also Stilp (2001), pp. 49-50.

⁴⁵ Torelli (1982), pp. 11-12, 15-16, and Plates I.3, I.4c-d, which illustrate the *suovetaurilia* sculpted on the 'altar' frieze; Stilp (2001), pp. 49-50, 92, and Figures 25-6.

3.2 Modern views of sacrifice and scapegoat

Turning away from the *Aeneid* for a while, sacrifice has been the subject of analytical study by numerous modern scholars. Their focus has been very varied, since sacrifice can be approached from a variety of perspectives, including, sociological, theological, ceremonial, anthropological, and psychological. Whilst these approaches may perhaps be considered anachronistic when applied to ancient literature, reception from the late nineteenth century onwards and interpretation by modern critics and commentators have inevitably been influenced by these post-classical disciplines.

Almost at the end of the nineteenth century, Hubert and Mauss published what turned out to be a landmark study which has been taken as a starting-point by subsequent researchers. They offer a generic definition of sacrifice in the following terms:

*‘Le sacrifice est un acte religieux qui, par la consécration d’ une victime, modifie l’ état de la personne morale qui l’ accomplit ou de certains objets auxquels elle s’ intéresse’.*⁴⁶

At the same time they recognize the diversity of purpose, differentiating *inter alia* between propitiation and expiation, as well as purification, thanksgiving and the making of vows. Nevertheless, despite the acknowledged complexity of sacrifice, they conclude that:

*‘... au fond, sous la diversité des formes qu’ il [le sacrifice] revêt, il est toujours fait d’ un même procédé qui peut être employé pour les buts les plus différents. Ce procédé consiste à établir une communication entre le monde sacré et le monde profane par l’ intermédiaire d’ une victime, c’ est-à-dire d’une chose détruite au cours de la cérémonie’.*⁴⁷

More recent scholars have rejected the idea of a general theory of sacrifice, but they have done so essentially because of the need to take account of a wide range of factors in different cultures and different situations, since the ‘theology’ and understanding of the underlying meaning and origins of sacrifice vary.⁴⁸ Amongst classical scholars, Walter Burkert has sought to identify an origin for sacrificial rituals

⁴⁶ Hubert & Mauss (1899), p. 13: the italics are theirs.

⁴⁷ Hubert & Mauss (1899), p. 76: the italics are theirs.

⁴⁸ Vernant (1981), p. 1; Kirk (1981), pp. 42-3.

in the practices of primitive societies which relied on hunting.⁴⁹ On the other hand, Girard has sought to find a common originating factor through his theory of ‘mimetic desire’ which combines emulation and jealousy taken to the extreme within a primitive tribal society, and culminates in a ‘sacrificial crisis’.⁵⁰ Others, such as Jean-Pierre Vernant, have looked at sacrifice within particular communities, seeing it as a form of social bonding mechanism, as in fifth-century Athens.⁵¹ These scholars do not disagree, however, on certain essential procedural elements, such as the requirement for three ‘players’, a sacrificer, the being/object sacrificed, and a divinity, as well as the destruction or death of what is sacrificed.⁵²

In the field of psychoanalytic theory, Sigmund Freud addresses sacrifice a number of times, but scarcely discusses procedure. In *The psychopathology of everyday life*, which went through ten updated editions between 1901 and 1924, he speaks of the loss, breakage or alienation of objects as unconscious (or in rare instances intentional) sacrificial acts by way of gratitude, propitiation, expiation, or self-punishment.⁵³ In all cases, however, the ‘sacrificer’ is deprived of something of value, usually unintentionally. Hence, Freud comments: ‘Losing objects of value ... may be offering a sacrifice to the obscure powers of destiny to whom homage is still paid among us to-day’.⁵⁴ Elsewhere, in *Totem and taboo*, he refers to sacrifice as: ‘... a simple offering to the deity, an act of renunciation in favour of the god’.⁵⁵ Carl Gustav Jung, also, wrote on the subject, stating that ‘a sacrifice consists in the first place in giving something which belongs to me’.⁵⁶ In addition to seeing a transfer of something to the deity, however, Jung recognized that ritual is often involved. Hence, in *Psychology and religion*, he tabulates stages of the Catholic mass, which have areas of considerable similarity with the observable elements of Graeco-Roman ritual, as tabulated by Kirk and in Table 4, above, as well as similarities with sacrificial procedure as represented in the visions of Zosimos with which Jung is making the comparison.⁵⁷

Freud, in particular, also leads us towards the more colloquial, secular definitions of sacrifice familiar in the modern world. In the absence of a religious or superstitious context, sacrifice is widely understood as giving up one thing in order to gain or achieve

⁴⁹ Burkert (1972/1983), Chapter I.

⁵⁰ Girard (1972/77); Girard (1982/86).

⁵¹ Vernant (1981), p. 26: ‘Sacrifier, c’est fondamentalement tuer pour manger.’

⁵² Vernant (1981), pp. 2-3.

⁵³ Freud (1901/24), pp. 169-70, 173, 175, 184-7.

⁵⁴ Freud (1901/24), p. 207.

⁵⁵ Freud (1913), p. 138.

⁵⁶ Jung (1954/69), p.255.

⁵⁷ Jung (1954/69), p. 266.

some other thing, usually of greater perceived value, as in a bishop for a queen.⁵⁸ What is given up is not necessarily a tangible possession, so could be an ambition or, indeed, a life. In the case of Palinurus, however, the test of *cui bono* fails, for no-one, including Neptune, appears to gain from the loss. Similar arguments apply also to use of the term ‘scapegoat’ which in modern usage has become detached from its original Biblical and classical associations both in psychology and in more colloquial usage.⁵⁹

3.3 The circumstances of Palinurus’ death

To return now to the *Aeneid*, it is somewhat surprising to find that not everyone is in agreement concerning the time, place and, manner of Palinurus’ death. A degree of confusion has arisen because, as commentators have pointed out, the two accounts of Palinurus’ last days at 5.827-71 and 6.337-83 do not accord in every detail. Five discrepancies between the two versions have been listed by various scholars,⁶⁰ and may be summarized as: (i) whether a god was responsible; (ii) Aeneas’ perception of what happened; (iii) the state of the sea/weather; (iv) the time taken for the ships and Palinurus to reach land; and (v) how to explain the reference to ‘*Libyco ... cursu*’ (6.338).

Before making an assessment of the nature of Palinurus’ death against criteria established in the above discussions, the important questions of time, place, and manner need to be settled. Hence, it is necessary to decide which (if either) of the two versions should be given priority and whether any of the discrepancies undermine the reliability of the preferred account. Obviously, the choice is between one version written by Vergil, who as narrator may be presumed to be ‘omniscient’,⁶¹ and another version also written by Vergil but placed in the mouth of Palinurus himself. The version in Book 6 is of course more concrete,⁶² and it is important to stress that, whatever the issues may be concerning the length of time Palinurus spent in the sea, the basic account of his murder in Book 6 is not at all inconsistent with the version in Book 5, which makes no mention of his death. Moreover, despite consensus that Book 5 was written after

⁵⁸ OED2E (1991), Vol. XIV, p. 341, s.v. sacrifice (vb): ‘3. To surrender or give up (something) for the attainment of some higher advantage or dearer object.’

⁵⁹ OED2E (1991), Vol. XIV, p. 582, s.v. scapegoating: ‘*spec. in Psychol.*, aggressively punitive behaviour directed for whatever reason against other (weaker) persons or groups.’

⁶⁰ Jacob (1952), p. 163; Williams (1960), pp. xxv-xxviii; Horsfall (1991), pp. 100-2; Hejduk (2001), p. 76; Horsfall (2013), pp. 274-6. Also discussed briefly by O’ Hara (2007), p. 92.

⁶¹ The narrator’s omniscience can occasionally be lost (Behr (2005), p. 212), but there is no reason to think that such is the case here.

⁶² *Contra* Augello (1987), p. 411, who considers the version in Book 5 ‘una [redazione] più completa e persuasiva’, while the version in Book 6 is ‘meno coerente’.

Book 6,⁶³ no plausible reason seems available to explain why Vergil might have wished in his later writing to undermine the veracity of the character of Palinurus.⁶⁴

Palinurus' credentials

In other parts of the poem Vergil portrays Palinurus in highly positive terms, not only by describing him as a steersman of great experience and authority (3.201-2, 512-20, 561-3, and perhaps as the *gubernator* at 3.269), but also by having Phorbas/Somnus address him with a patronymic which suggests that Palinurus may possibly have been related, albeit distantly, to Aeneas himself (*Iaside Palinure*: 5.843).⁶⁵ Similarly, Palinurus' stature is also enhanced by evident intertextual associations with heroic helmsmen whose deaths had been related in earlier epics, firstly Phrontis in the *Odyssey*, who, like Palinurus, was an outstanding helmsman (3.282-3),⁶⁶ and who also died clinging to the steering oar (3.281) although he did not go overboard,⁶⁷ and secondly Tiphys in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautika*, who died as a result of illness (2.854-6), but who on his own initiative had, like Palinurus at *Aeneid* 3.513-20, aroused the crew on two occasions to take to sea (1.522-3; 1.1274-5).⁶⁸ All of these factors strongly suggest that Palinurus' veracity in Book 6 is not to be impugned, and that his own version of his death is therefore to be preferred.⁶⁹ Indeed, the question would arise as to whether a spirit, even if retaining some of the attributes of the living, would be capable of falsifying the story of his own death, and, if so, to what end.

Involvement of a god

Palinurus' categorical denial of the involvement of any god in his misfortune (6.348) tends to support a demythologized rather than (or as well as) a literal reading of the rôle of Somnus as described at 5.838-61 (see Chapter 2.7 for discussion). To give credence to the version in Book 6, the reader has to imagine that, in his after-death

⁶³ Heinze (1915), p. 147 (continuation of p. 146 n. 1); Jacob (1952), p. 165; Williams (1960), p. xxiv; Augello (1987), p. 411; Kehoe (1989), pp. 249, 257, 258 n. 1.

⁶⁴ For a dissenting view concerning order of composition: Horsfall (2013), p. 276, Horsfall (2016), p. 91 n. 49.

⁶⁵ If the Iasus or Iasius referred to in this patronymic was the (half-)brother of Dardanus (as at 3.168), Palinurus and Aeneas would have been distant cousins: Köves-Zulauf (1998/99), p. 313. Palinurus could also have been related (probably more closely) to the doctor *Iapyx Iasides* (12.391-2). McKay (1984), p. 128 with n. 22, identifies Palinurus and Iapyx as brothers, sons of Iasius [but the Iasius must surely have been of a later generation]; Horsfall (2013), p. 274 (b), casts doubt on this 'royal' association. Tarrant (2012), p. 190, note to 12.391-2, makes no mention of the possible connexion with Palinurus.

⁶⁶ *Odyssey* 3.282-3: ὃς ἐκαίνυτο φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων | νῆα κυβερνῆσαι.

⁶⁷ *Odyssey* 3.281: πηδάλιον μετὰ χερσὶ θεούσης νηὸς ἔχοντα.

⁶⁸ Nelis (2001), pp. 221-3; Nelis also notes (pp. 205-7) similarities with Butes, who, at *Argonautica* 4.912-6, when in the same general vicinity, was overcome by the song of the Sirens, and threw himself overboard.

⁶⁹ Horsfall (2016), pp. 91-2 (consistent with his view that Book 6 was written later): 'bk.6, ... , does seem the likelier candidate for a final text'.

‘existence’ before crossing the Styx, Palinurus retains certain living human faculties, including memory, in much the same way as in the trans-Stygian environment Deiphobus retains not only his memory, but also his mutilated human physical features (6.494-7). Had it been otherwise and had Palinurus enjoyed the privileged knowledge accorded to Anchises in the Elysian Fields, then the encounter with Aeneas would inevitably have been different. Allowing that Palinurus retained his memory, he might nevertheless have been prone to confusion as to the number of days he had passed in the sea, or inclined to exaggerate to impress his leader. On the other hand, although protracted endurance can blur the memory as to duration, it seems highly improbable that Palinurus would misremember or be confused about the manner of his death.

Even if a god had been involved, however, Palinurus would not necessarily have known about it.⁷⁰ His denial would also seem to imply an acceptance of his own human culpability (despite being described by the narrator as *insoniti* at 5.841), an acknowledgment such as might be expected from the officer of the watch with sole responsibility for the navigation and safety of a vessel during a nocturnal passage (5.836-7). Such an admission would also be consistent both with Palinurus’ own comments at 5.848-51 and with Aeneas’ valedictory lament at 5.870-1, which Barchiesi and others have identified as an epigram (or epi(c)gram, as Martin Dinter refers to it).⁷¹ That Aeneas subsequently asks what god was responsible, however, does not seem in any way inconsistent with his initial reaction, since it is well within a god’s capability to cause a helmsman to be negligent.

Weather and length of time at sea

The question still remains as to whether any of the other discrepancies undermine the reliability of the Book 6 account. It is worthwhile, therefore, reviewing the other differences briefly in order to help clarify circumstances and hence to establish beyond reasonable doubt the veracity and reliability of the pertinent elements of Palinurus’ own version. Horsfall provides the most recent analysis of the discrepancies, concluding that ‘the versions would never have coexisted after a final revision’.⁷² Whilst I agree up to a point, especially concerning the problem of *Libyco ... cursu*, it is worth revisiting the details concerning the state of the sea/weather and the time required to reach land in order to see whether the discrepancies can be further reduced.

⁷⁰ Harrison, E L (1980), p. 372 n. 43.

⁷¹ Barchiesi (1979); Kyriakidis (1998), p. 41; Dinter (2005), p. 155-6, 158-9.

⁷² Horsfall (2013), p. 276. More briefly, also: Horsfall (2016), pp. 90-2.

Firstly, Palinurus' assertion that he was in the sea for three nights and reached land at dawn on the fourth day (6.355-7) may well be explicable as an exaggeration, the confused recollection of a man traumatized and in a state of utter exhaustion. Similarly, his statement that the sea was *aspera* (351) and the wind *violentus* (356) may reflect the different perspective of a man in the water as compared with the perceptions of those safely on board, or, again, exaggeration for effect. Moreover, although we do not know where he went overboard, the fleet could be imagined as still south of Capo Palinuro, since the currents at that point in the Tyrrhenian Sea run northwards up the coast from Sicily towards the Bay of Naples.⁷³ Furthermore, if Palinurus went overboard south of Capo Palinuro, the fleet would still have had a further 80 nautical miles or so to travel in order to reach Cumae, requiring a sailing time of at least a further 13 hours (see below).

Secondly, it may also be imagined that the fleet would have stopped for a while (even at night) to search for Palinurus as soon as his absence had been noticed. Such a pause in progress would be consistent with what might well be expected to be standard procedure in such a circumstance, as well as with Neptune's utterance:

unus erit tantum, amissum quem gurgite quaeres; (5.814)⁷⁴

Thirdly, although Paul Jacob and Williams assert that the voyage from Drepanum to Cumae at the end of Book 5 is completed in only one day, the time taken is not actually indicated in the text.⁷⁵ Horsfall is more circumspect, questioning the time needed for the fleet to sail from Lucanian waters to Cumae, and accepting that three days in the sea for Palinurus is just about credible.⁷⁶ Indeed, except to say that the ships arrive at Cumae 'at last' (*tandem*: 6.2), which could refer to that stage of the journey or to the whole seven or more years, Vergil is silent concerning the duration of the voyage from Drepanum, no doubt so as to maintain the momentum of the narrative. In fact, sailing close to the coast, which the *Aeneadae* would most likely have done in unfamiliar waters without modern navigational aids, and as they had done throughout their journey wherever possible,⁷⁷ the distance from Trapani to Naples is 342 nautical

⁷³ Arnaud (2005), pp. 24-5. Neptune's favourable wind would also assist Palinurus.

⁷⁴ Even though Neptune uses the second person singular, it is highly improbable that Venus would do any searching, so the meaning evidently applies to Aeneas, as in the generally rejected variant 'quaeret' (see Williams (1960), p. 193, note to 5.814).

⁷⁵ Jacob (1952), p. 163; Williams (1960), p. xxv. Also, Quint (1993), p. 87.

⁷⁶ Horsfall (2013), pp. 275-6. The short Tyrrhenian coast of Lucania/Basilicata is just south of Capo Palinuro.

⁷⁷ For example, up the western coast of the Peloponnese, and then across from Acroceraunia (north of Corfu) and on to Sicily via Castrum Minervae and the instep of Italy, as described in Book 3, where the words *cursusque brevissimus undis* (3.507) indicate that the Trojans adopt the shortest transit of open sea

miles.⁷⁸ With a favourable wind and under full sail, it is extremely unlikely that they could have achieved a speed of more than 6-7 knots, especially bearing in mind that a fleet travels at the speed of its slowest vessels, and that at least two of the nineteen vessels which arrived were biremes (8.79), rather than faster triremes.⁷⁹ Even without a break to search for a man overboard, therefore, the voyage would have required more than two days (49-57 hours).⁸⁰ The requisite speed to complete the voyage in 24 hours would have been more than 14 knots, well beyond the capability of any ship in the twelfth century BCE or in Roman times.

All factors considered, therefore, the apparent discrepancy between the times taken to reach land by the fleet and by Palinurus has been significantly reduced, leaving sufficient time for Palinurus still to reach the Underworld before Aeneas. Moreover the fact that the fleet must have taken more than a day to reach Cumae from Drepanum would also help to explain why, when the Sibyl states that one of their comrades lies dead and unburied (6.149-50), Aeneas and Achates are puzzled (6.160-2) and do not immediately think of the possibility that Palinurus' corpse has been washed up on the shore somewhere.

Mode of death

Perhaps understandably, some scholars have taken the view that Palinurus drowned,⁸¹ even though no mention of his death is made in Book 5. Moreover, Neptune's statement at 5.814 (quoted above) simply refers to one who will be lost (and looked for) at sea, but says nothing as to whether or not that individual is also to die at sea. Indeed, the idea that Palinurus drowned can only be sustained if his own account in Book 6 is rejected. I propose to argue, however, that had Vergil wanted to amend his text in order to make it clear that Palinurus drowned, a number of other (probably undesirable) consequential changes would have become necessary.

(cf. Williams (1972), p. 310, note to 3.506 ff.). Dionysius of Halicarnassus also indicates that it was the practice of Aeneas' fleet to skirt the coast (Ῥωμαϊκὴ ἀρχαιολογία: 1.51.1, 2, 3).

⁷⁸ See: <http://sea-distances.com>: Trapani to Messina plus Messina to Naples = 167 + 175 nautical miles.

⁷⁹ Maximum speeds noted: Mohler (1948), p. 56: 7 knots; Casson (1951), p. 140: 6.2 knots; Arnaud (2005), Table 3, p. 102-4: 7 knots. Casson (1971), p. 288, concludes that under favourable wind conditions ancient vessels averaged between 4 and 6 knots over open water. Of course, reference to biremes and triremes is anachronistic.

⁸⁰ ORBIS: The Stanford Geospatial Network Model of the Roman World calculates duration of sea voyages on the basis of around 3.5 knots. <http://orbis.stanford.edu/#using>.

⁸¹ Heinze (1915), p. 452 n.1; Parry (1963), p. 69; Putnam (1965), pp. 79, 81, 85; Coleman (1982), p. 156; Putnam (1984), p. 237; and O' Hara (1990), p. 106, all speak explicitly of death by drowning; Nelis (2001), p. 206: initially has 'drowning', but later '(potentially) drowned'; Knight (1966) has both 'seems to be drowned' (p. 352), and 'killed by a wild tribe' (p. 353); Augello (1987), p. 411, implies drowning, since he speaks of a '*seconda morte*' in Book 6; Farrell (1999), p. 98, also implies drowning. The assertion in Erasmo (2008), p. 80, that Aeneas' helmsman Misenus [*sic*] 'jumps overboard' [*sic*] scarcely warrants consideration.

Were we to suppose, however, that if Vergil had lived to eradicate the discrepancies between Books 5 and 6, he might have changed one or more of the three fundamental facts concerning Palinurus' death, the consequential impact of such changes would have been significant. As things stand, Palinurus' death, occurring just after he reaches land as the first Trojan to make contact with the western coast of Italy, provides the topographical aetiology for Capo Palinuro (6.381). Moreover, the link with the Homeric character Elpenor also requires Palinurus to remain unburied and for there to be a theoretical possibility (although overruled by the Sibyl at 6.373-81) for Aeneas to return to bury Palinurus' body. If Palinurus had died at sea and his body had been washed up on the shore, aetiology would still have been possible, as there would still have been an unburied corpse, but the Sibyl's prophecy of the *prodigiis ... caelestibus* (6.379) which provide the stimulus for Palinurus' burial would have had to be modified.⁸² Palinurus' mode of death would then have been almost identical to that of Misenus, and consequently the impact of the two intertwined but differentiated elements of the double link with Elpenor would have been reduced (see Chapter 5.2 for discussion of the Palinurus-Misenus 'doublet').

Overall judgment

The importance of the differences in the accounts of the events affecting Palinurus has now been much diminished. Moreover, the discrepancies do not undermine Palinurus' veracity, as would be necessary in order to sustain the view that he drowned. Accordingly, over the three questions as to when, where and how he died, at least, there can be no doubt. Palinurus died after having survived some unspecified time in the sea, he died after having reached land, and he died violently at the hands of hostile tribesmen. Questions concerning the state of the weather and exactly how long Palinurus was in the sea can be explained, albeit not with certainty, while only the reference to the *Libyco ... cursu* remains unresolvable.

3.4 Palinurus' death as 'sacrifice'

Having established that Palinurus dies at the hands of tribesmen who hope (almost certainly in vain) for *praedam* (6.361), and that he will eventually be buried beside the sea, we can return to the consideration of the terms sacrifice, pharmakós, and *devotio*.

⁸² Servius on 6.378 sees these *prodigiis* as historical fact, specifically a plague which afflicted the Lucanians and which, on the instruction of an oracle, caused them to dedicate a grove and a tomb to Palinurus.

When the fate suffered by Palinurus is considered in the light of the numerous ‘normal’ descriptions of sacrifice to be found in the *Aeneid* and other ancient sources, as well as in the light of modern views of sacrifice, the mismatch is obvious. There is no priest or celebrant, no ritual, and no witness. The protocol of sacrifice is also unclear, since it would need to be an almost unique instance of one god (Somnus) sacrificing to another (presumably Neptune).⁸³ Furthermore, it would be a bizarre (and completely implausible) example of a delayed sacrificial death engineered by Somnus but carried out some days later by the Italian tribesmen. Nor is the critical word ‘*immolare*’ introduced. Moreover, despite the small number of notable Vergilian examples of the captives taken by Aeneas for execution at Pallas’ funeral and of the deaths of Haemonides and Turnus, human sacrifice was generally considered repugnant and un-Roman in the period of the late Republic and early Empire,⁸⁴ although rare earlier examples can be cited, mostly in literature based upon mythology.

The Palinurus episode, therefore, exhibits none of the outwardly observable attributes of sacrificial procedure which Vergil describes in numerous other places in the *Aeneid*, and which are set out in Table 4, above, and confirmed from other sources. Similarly none of the attributes noted by modern anthropologists and psychologists is in evidence. Neither Freudian unconscious nor conscious self-punishing expiation nor Girardian mimetic desire can be perceived in any of the characters or in the situation. The tribesmen do, of course, display a desire for booty, but it is certainly not mimetic. Nor can the perpetrators be said to experience any inclination towards expiation until, after the event, the Lucanians (who may or may not have been of the same tribe) are afflicted by *prodigiis ... caelestibus* (6.379). Furthermore, no immediate advantage, as in a bishop for a queen, seems to be gained by any mortal or god.

Some of the same objections also apply to *devotio*, but above all there is no suggestion that Palinurus’ fate was in any way a voluntary self-sacrifice. Arguments against Palinurus being identified as a *pharmakós* are slightly different. A similarity may be perceived in that Palinurus is sent out, so to speak, still alive, to fend for himself. Equally, his subsequent murder is consistent with having been sent out defenceless. On the other hand, there is no formal preparation or ceremonial and no witness (or at least no human witness) to his being sent out, whilst a scapegoat is

⁸³ Vernant (1981), p. 34, cites the unusual, possibly unique instance of the infant Hermes sacrificing two stolen cows in the Homeric Hymn to Hermes (ll. 115-37), but argues that the incident does not constitute a proper sacrifice.

⁸⁴ Scullard (1981), p. 15, and also p. 121, based upon Livy XXII.57.6: ‘*minime Romano sacro*’.

normally expelled in front of the people whom he is to save from sin or affliction. Nor is there any obvious reason why Palinurus should be seen either as some sort of saviour or as a vehicle for the vicarious expiation of collective sins. Indeed, any sins may actually be seen as Palinurus' own, not only his failure to live up to his own rigorous standards as a sea-captain by falling asleep at his post, but also his abuse of the sea (and therefore of Neptune) as a *monstrum* (5.849) and the tone of his words at 5.848-51, which suggest possible hubristic pride in his own capabilities. To this extent, Palinurus' headlong plunge into the sea and his subsequent murder may perhaps be seen as his nemesis or punishment, far from an expiatory sacrifice.

Even less convincing are suggestions, mooted with some qualification by Lee Fratantuono, that the death of Palinurus may be seen as a 'retributive sacrificial offering' for the apparent non-fulfilment of Cloanthus' vow (5.235-8),⁸⁵ or 'at least in part a sacrifice to the Sirens'.⁸⁶

More than any other factor, Neptune's utterance concluding his speech to Venus is likely to have been responsible for Palinurus having been seen as a victim of sacrifice:

unum pro multis dabitur caput. (5.815)⁸⁷

This part-line, which is beautifully succinct, consisting of four complete feet (two spondees followed by two dactyls),⁸⁸ may also be seen as foreshadowing Turnus' *devotio* at 12.694-5 (*unum / pro vobis*), and has in any event caused some scholars in the Judaeo-Christian tradition to make a comparison with the sacrifice of Christ. Henry specifically refers to the New Testament:⁸⁹

εἷς ἄνθρωπος ἀποθάνη ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος ἀπόληται (John, 11.50)

unus moriatur homo pro populo et non tota gens pereat (ibidem, Vulgate)

Whilst this comparison may perhaps be understandable in a nineteenth century and early twentieth century context, it begs (and fails to answer) the critical question as to the danger from which the *multi* are to be preserved. The only plausible answer could be that the *multi* are the *Aeneadae* and that the 'sacrifice' of Palinurus will protect them

⁸⁵ Fratantuono (2015), pp. 138-9.

⁸⁶ Fratantuono (2015), p. 142.

⁸⁷ Worth noting is that the metrical pattern of this portentous line (SSDD) has an incidence of under 2 per cent in the *Aeneid* as a whole (Duckworth (1969): see discussion below, in Chapter 4.0 and Appendix), thereby underscoring its significance (however interpreted).

⁸⁸ Sparrow (1931), p. 27.

⁸⁹ Henry (1889), p. 199.

from further disaster at sea. Dinter expresses this view particularly strongly: ‘His is the one important life whose sacrifice (*unum pro multis* 5.815) guarantees the safe journey of the Trojans’.⁹⁰ This interpretation, however, reads too much into Neptune’s words, for not only is this very short-term, given that serious set-backs and trials await the Trojans on the mainland of Italy only a few days later, but it is also difficult to reconcile with the fact that Neptune has already stressed to Venus how well-disposed he has been, and is, towards Aeneas (5.800-13). Indeed any danger threatening the *Aeneadae* would come from Juno, not from Neptune. Consequently, it seems better to interpret Neptune’s statement as either simply a prediction, or as a fee or *quid pro quo*, for the favour granted to Venus, even though apparently willingly granted. After all, no god does anything for nothing.⁹¹ I shall return to the interpretation of 5.815 in Chapter 5.3.

3.5 Conclusion: Palinurus’ death reclassified

In the preceding pages, I believe I have shown sufficiently that the unfortunate loss and death of Palinurus fit neither the paradigm of sacrifice as portrayed in the rest of the *Aeneid*, nor modern conceptions of sacrifice. Indeed, in the specific instance of Palinurus it seems highly unlikely that, even on a broad interpretation, the events relating to him, as described in Books 5 and 6, would evoke in Roman or even in modern readers/listeners an immediate mental picture of sacrifice. The same is also true for the designations of *devotio* and *pharmakós*. Yet, since the term ‘sacrifice’ is so much used (and the other terms also, but rather less so), it may be useful to try to understand why so many have adopted this vocabulary, even though the terms are prone to mislead through the images and semantic associations which they conjure up.

Certainly, the terms are often used very loosely, sometimes as merely passing references, but a closer look at a major proponent of the idea of sacrifice, namely Bandera, will be useful.⁹² Whilst Bandera does not focus solely on Palinurus, he links him with others in the *Aeneid* whose deaths may appear to be ‘random or accidental’, specifically Orontes, Creusa, and Misenus.⁹³ None of these deaths meets the criteria I have established. What becomes evident, however, from Bandera’s article and from other relevant works is that these deaths fit into the pervasive pattern of lives lost in the

⁹⁰ Dinter (2005), p. 158.

⁹¹ Coleman (1982), p. 156: ‘Even a god must be paid’; cf. also Versnel (1981), p. 179: ‘... one fundamental principle: nothing for nothing, man always pays’.

⁹² Bandera (1981); Nicoll (1988).

⁹³ Bandera (1981), p. 226.

transit from Troy to Latium (with the exception of Creusa, who may not have died at all, but who is translated miraculously to the world of the immortals thanks to Cybele: 2.788). Bandera sees these deaths as being on an ‘implicit sacrificial level’.⁹⁴ Describing these incidents as sacrifice (or any of the other terms), however, is stretching its semantic field, but on the wider canvas of the quest for a place to found a new civilization and the longer-term acquisition of empire, these four individuals (as well as many others) have undoubtedly made their contribution. Hence, they fit into the overall picture conveyed by the ‘other voices’ of Vergil, that is, the horrendous cost of empire in terms of human suffering, as perceived and expostulated by Adam Parry and others.⁹⁵ The *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* summarizes this well:

‘... l’ accettazione corrente del termine s[acrificium]. si dilata per abbracciare ogni fatto di sangue, di guerra, di tradimento, inganno e vendetta, il suicidio di Didone, e la stessa distruzione di Troia: tutti eventi cruenti, qui presentati come altrettanti segni premonitori e veicoli preparatori del sacro destino riservato dagli dei all’ eroe, ...’⁹⁶

Notwithstanding this ‘dilated’ definition of sacrifice, which embraces the diverse circumstances of, *inter alios*, Laocoön, Priam, Creusa (if she really dies), and Dido, this article makes no mention of Palinurus.

Viewing Palinurus in terms of sacrifice or something similar has the effect of detracting from the real significance of Palinurus’ loss, which is as a strategic, symbolic, and metapoetic milestone in the transition from Troy to Rome. On the narrative plane, the series of long sea voyages is almost over, the ships guide themselves past the notoriously dangerous islands of the Sirens (5.862-5) in accordance with Neptune’s prediction, and Aeneas takes the helm (5.868). Palinurus is redundant and the focus now shifts to Aeneas, who henceforth shows himself to be a single-minded Roman leader, reliant on nobody (least of all a seafarer). The loss of Palinurus signals this strategic change in leadership and ethnic focus.⁹⁷

Symbolically, since Palinurus meets his end somewhere along the coast of southern Campania, he (along with others who perished in or by the sea: Orontes (1.113, 220, 6.334), Leucaspis (6.334), and Misenus) may stand for the many Roman

⁹⁴ Bandera (1981), p. 224.

⁹⁵ Parry (1963); cf. also: Lyne (1987); Fowler (1990).

⁹⁶ D and V Lanternari in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* IV (1988), p. 633, s.v. sacrificium.

⁹⁷ Farrell (1999), p. 104, also sees Aeneas as a ‘son’ succeeding to the rôle of ‘father’ previously fulfilled in terms of leadership at sea by Palinurus.

sailors who perished in the vicinity both during the First Punic War, when the Roman fleet was shipwrecked off Cape Palinurus in 253 BCE,⁹⁸ and during the ill-starred campaigns at sea against Sextus Pompeius, both in 38,⁹⁹ and particularly in 36 BCE.¹⁰⁰ More generally, Palinurus may also stand, by way of synecdoche, for the human suffering which was the price of Rome's greatness. In these senses, he is, indeed, one who represents many.

At the same time, at a metapoetic level, Vergil's own journey moves from sea to land. Just as Aeneas prepares to descend to the Underworld and then to undertake the land war in Latium, Vergil steers his epic vehicle – his metaphorical flagship – away from the *errores* of the Odyssean half of the *Aeneid* towards the second, Iliadic half of the poem. This radical change of poetic impetus is made explicit later, in the appeal to Erato in the second proem (7.37-45), especially:

tu uatem, tu, diua, mone. dicam horrida bella,
dicam acies actosque animis in funera reges,
Tyrrhenamque manum totamque sub arma coactam
Hesperiam. maior rerum mihi nascitur ordo,
maius opus moueo. (7.41-5)

In conclusion, therefore, of course Palinurus' loss and death is tragic and affecting, but attention is diverted from a critical step in the overall narrative by gracing the episode with the vocabulary of sacrifice, even in its loosest sense.

⁹⁸ Knight (1966), p. 353; Brenk (1988), pp. 69-70.

⁹⁹ Brenk (1984), p. 789: Octavian's flagship was destroyed in a storm in the vicinity in 38, and later in the same year more ships were driven on to rocks in a battle off Cumae.

¹⁰⁰ Brenk (1984), p. 790: even greater disasters took place at sea in 36, including the loss of ships during a storm off Cape Palinurus. Moreover, Octavian's arch-enemy Sextus Pompeius proclaimed himself the adoptive son of Neptune.

4. Labyrinthine chronology in the Daedalus ekphrasis

Daedalus, as the first word of 6.14, signals an entirely new and unexpected topic, which at first look may appear to be a digression recounting an apparently unrelated story in the manner of an epyllion. A sudden change of subject (not merely grammatical) accompanied by significant shifts, firstly of time and then of place, leads quickly into an ekphrasis describing an imagined, beautifully wrought (δαίδαλος), work of art supposed to have been created by Daedalus.¹ Moreover, the significance and exotic nature of this passage are emphasized by a concentration of unusual metrical patterns, the permutation of dactylic and spondaic feet in over half of the lines having an incidence of less than ten per cent in the *Aeneid* overall.² Indeed the pattern exhibited by possibly the most menacing line in the ekphrasis (a spondee followed by three dactyls) is the least common in the poem,³ occurring in only approximately two per cent of lines in the whole poem:

Mīnō|tāurūs īn|ēst, // Vēñē|rīs mōnī|menta nefandae (6.26)

Numerous points for enquiry and discussion arise from this ekphrasis. Dissenting from both Richard Heinze and Eduard Norden, however, who saw this ekphrasis as a digression delaying the narrative in order to generate suspense prior to the appearance of the Sibyl, my overall purpose in this chapter is to demonstrate how the ekphrasis is an integral part of the Transitional Section, as well as of the poem as a whole.⁴

There is precedent earlier in the poem for a description of temple art within the flow of the narrative (1.453-93), but the change here is undoubtedly abrupt,⁵ even though, as Horsfall correctly points out, *Chalcidicaque* (6.17) and other words in the ekphrasis connect back to the current location, some way up the hill from the place

¹ Ekphrasis is here understood in its modern, restricted sense of ‘a description of a work of art’, (Goldhill (2009)), rather than as an ancient rhetorical term, as in Webb (2009). The ekphrasis discussed in this chapter are all ‘notional’, portraying imaginary rather than real works of art.

² See Appendix for a full analysis of metrical patterns in the ekphrasis.

³ Duckworth (1969), pp. 7, 156 (Table I). Duckworth also notes (p. 55) a correlation between subject matter and metre, passages of a ‘more emotional and dramatic nature’ (as here) having a lower incidence of the more common metrical patterns.

⁴ Heinze (1915), p. 399: ‘Virgil ... muß Aeneas, bis ... die Sibylle erscheint, beschäftigen’; Norden (1927), p. 120, note to 6.14 ff., refers to the description of the temple and the doors as a ‘retardierende Motiv’ and an ‘ihn [Aeneas] nichts angehende Darstellung’.

⁵ Segal (1965), p. 643; Fitzgerald (1984), p. 52.

where the Trojans had landed (*Euboicis Cumarum ... oris*, 6.2).⁶ This ekphrasis comes very soon after the sad opening lines of the book (*Sic fatur lacrimans*: 6.1), which run on seamlessly from the closing lines of Book 5, and which set the mood for the ekphrasis.⁷ Following the safe arrival and orderly anchoring of the fleet (6.3-5), the next short scene briefly shows the Trojans busily engaged in foraging (6.5-8). Aeneas, however, sets out with an unspecified number of companions towards the Temple of Apollo on the Cumaean heights, aiming to meet the Sibyl (6.9-13).⁸ It is this temple which provides the trigger for the ekphrasis. After some brief narrative introducing the backward shift to the time of King Minos (6.14-19), the ekphrasis proper starts at 6.20, again somewhat abruptly, and moves the fictional location to Crete, continuing in staccato fashion, with only one finite verb in the first three lines. Images wrought in gold (6.32) on the doors of the temple seize the attention of the group of Trojans. Their progress and the progress of the narrative are thus brought to a halt as they look at and no doubt reflect upon images of extraordinary events from a wholly different era which are portrayed graphically before their eyes.

William Fitzgerald's 1984 article entitled 'Aeneas, Daedalus and the Labyrinth' is an excellent starting-point for a consideration of the Daedalus ekphrasis in the *Aeneid* (6.14-33). One of Fitzgerald's principal arguments focuses on the interaction between the static nature of art and the dynamic flow of historical time. His article demonstrates how, in the Daedalus ekphrasis, Vergil's narrative brings about a transition from spatial representation in art to 'the open-ended world of history'. Repetition is the agent of this transformation, by means of which 'the past is first frozen and then reintegrated into history', thus leading the reader 'out of the frame of art'.⁹ Having exercised his pity for Pasiphaë with disastrous outcome, as recorded in his art, Daedalus effectively renews that past action by taking pity on Ariadne (*miseratus*: 6.28). Unwanted results again ensue, firstly the imprisonment of Daedalus himself, then his ingenious escape with the subsequent loss of his son. Indeed, so recent is the death of Icarus that Daedalus is unable to portray it when sculpting the series of images made as a thanks-offering to Apollo for safe arrival. Fitzgerald also argues that in renewing the past, Daedalus' actions foreshadow a similar repetition of the past on the part of Aeneas. The Trojan

⁶ Horsfall (2013), p. 86, §(1), also referring *Phoebe* (6.18) back to *Apollo* (6.9), and *immania templa* (6.19) to *aurea tecta* (6.13). Lane Fox (2008), pp. 139, 148-9, indicates that Greeks from Chalcis and Eretria, in Euboea, established a colony at Cumae in the mid-eighth century BCE, some years after the early eighth-century offshore settlement on the island of Ischia.

⁷ For discussion of the seamless transition from Book 5 to Book 6 see Introduction.

⁸ Rutledge (1971/2), p. 111, incorrectly states that Aeneas is accompanied by the faithful Achates when viewing the images. Having evidently been sent on ahead, Achates returns at 6.34-5.

⁹ Fitzgerald (1984); quoted phrases taken respectively from pp. 61, 57, and 55.

War, which Aeneas had seen recorded in the static art of Juno's temple in Carthage (1.453-93), will be renewed in the live history of the Iliadic half of the *Aeneid*. Moreover, Fitzgerald points out that, at the end of the poem, Aeneas' pursuit of Turnus is described in terms reminiscent of the labyrinthine *lusus Troiae*,¹⁰ itself a dynamic, artistic performance portrayed in words through the artistic skill of the poet.

Other particularly important analyses of the Daedalus ekphrasis have been contributed by Page duBois, in a comparative work covering Homer, Vergil, Dante, and Spenser, and by Michael Putnam in an article subsequently included, with some minor revision, in his monograph on Vergil's ekphraseis.¹¹ These will be referred to in later discussion. I shall also refer briefly to work on ekphrasis in general by Don Fowler and Andrew Laird.¹²

In developing my argument in this chapter, I propose to pursue a line of investigation which emphasizes one element of Fitzgerald's spatial-temporal perspective, namely the temporal aspect of the ekphrasis. Implicit in the ekphrasis are three chronological levels which enable perceptive readers to see how analogies drawn from mythology and archaic history can cast a subtle light on situations and characters of later times. Hence, I shall look at the images on the doors from three chronological perspectives, namely the ancient mythological past of King Minos, the fictitious present of Aeneas and his followers, and the real present of the Augustan age. Additionally, I shall highlight and discuss self-referential allusions and metapoetic associations which may be traced beneath the surface of the Daedalus passage.

4.1 Viewers and readers

Within the text, the Trojans evidently view the temple doors with some interest, for they are inclined to tarry longer to peruse more (*omnia | perlegerent oculis, ni ... : 6.34*).¹³ Yet apart from this reluctance to move on, no further information about their reaction is disclosed, and it is unclear whether they have any prior knowledge of the characters and events depicted on the doors. Nothing at all is vouchsafed concerning the thoughts and emotions of Aeneas, who views the doors with his comrades. Readers,

¹⁰ Fitzgerald (1984), pp. 60-1, comparing 12.763-5 with 5.583-4, 593.

¹¹ duBois (1982), Chapter 2, pp. 28-51; Putnam (1998b), Chapter 4, pp. 73-99 [= *idem* (1987) = *idem* (1995c), incorporating minor revisions]. In subsequent references regarding the Daedalus ekphrasis, only Putnam (1998b) will be cited.

¹² Fowler (1991, 1996); Laird (1996).

¹³ Elsner (1996), p. 1, highlights the significant use here of a word indicating that the images are 'read'.

therefore, are placed in a position in which they may draw their own conclusions and respond individually, uninfluenced by the reactions of viewers in the text.

Along with the Trojans inside the text, readers of Vergil's own time and later are also invited metaphorically to fix their eyes upon the images on the temple doors. For those outside the text, however, the implicit invitation is different in nature and more complex, since such external observers 'see' only those sculptures which the poet has described with the written word. As a result, in this particular instance, a situation is created in which readers 'see' less than the Trojans. Yet, whilst the Trojans are privileged actually to see more, informed readers are privileged differently in so far as they have greater knowledge, with which they are able to interpret both what Vergil has presented to them and what he has not. As Fitzgerald comments in the context of his analysis of the ekphrasis in Catullus' *Carmen* 64, the pleasure which viewers (or, here, readers) gain 'depends on our oscillation between entering the particular scene and knowing the whole story'.¹⁴ Indeed, Vergil causes readers to exercise their own knowledge and imagination very considerably by making the ekphrasis operate on three chronological planes. Thus, the reader not only 'sees' selected scenes sculpted on the temple doors depicting the mythological past, but may supply presumed omissions and relate the scenes to Aeneas' fictitious present and to the Augustan future/present, potentially noting at the same time other symbolic and metapoetic elements which lie within the text. By intertwining three levels of chronology, Vergil, gathers together in the one passage a large number of thematic threads which run throughout the fabric of the *Aeneid*, thereby using the ekphrasis to 'look out toward the larger text in which it is embedded'.¹⁵

How any particular reader may interpret and react to the written description of the series of images on the temple doors is, of course, likely to be very individual. As discussed in Chapter 1.1, readers or groups of readers conditioned by different backgrounds and/or living in different historical periods may respond very differently. Diverse readers will make different connexions. Through his reticence in this particular ekphrasis, especially, Vergil may seem to invite every reader to construct his/her own individual pictures and to interpret them accordingly.

¹⁴ Fitzgerald (1995), p. 154.

¹⁵ Putnam (1998b), p. 158 (concerning the shield of Aeneas ekphrasis), with a similar phrase on p. 161: 'reaching out into the larger text'.

4.2 Contrasts with other ekphraseis in the *Aeneid*

Before proceeding to discussion of the individual tiered chronologies of the Daedalus ekphrasis, it will be useful to review briefly how it differs from the other ekphraseis of works of art in the *Aeneid*.

Differences are immediately apparent when the Daedalus passage is compared with the other two major ekphraseis of imagined works of art, namely the pictures in the Temple of Juno at Carthage (1.453-93),¹⁶ and the shield forged for Aeneas by Vulcan (8.626-728). The Daedalus ekphrasis with its nineteen and a half lines is much shorter and more condensed than the other two, which extend to 41 and 102 lines respectively. Most remarkably, however, unlike all of the other ekphraseis in the *Aeneid* and other extant ancient epic, whether earlier or later, the Daedalus ekphrasis features in some of the door panels the artist who sculpted them.¹⁷ Whilst both of the other two major ekphraseis are introduced without noticeable hiatus in the flow of the narrative, this passage begins abruptly and ends even more abruptly, with an interruption in mid-line (*quin*: 6.33) at the moment when Daedalus' hands fail him.

At a basic descriptive level, before the scene moves metaphorically to Crete, the initial location, encompassing the Cumaean heights, the temples, and the Sibyl's cave, is described in more detail than in the other two instances.¹⁸ As Karl Galinsky points out, 'these are real places' which effect a 'concretization of the locale at the very beginning'.¹⁹ Consequently, the geography of the area around Cumae, and the location and surroundings of the temple and the Sibyl's cave have been important topics of discussion for both archaeologists and classicists, especially following the discovery of a cave nearby during excavations carried out under the supervision of Amedeo Maiuri in the spring of 1932.²⁰ In terms of the subject matter, each of the other two ekphraseis explicitly illustrates events in which Aeneas or his descendants have been or will be participants. At Carthage, Aeneas is able to look back over images of the past history of

¹⁶ Most likely to be imagined as murals, as per Putnam (1998b), chapter 1, pp. 23-54; presumably, on the basis of *pictura* (1.464), painted, although conceivably mosaic; but sculptures, per Putnam (1998b), pp. 85 (twice), 228, n. 20, seem unlikely even as a frieze.

¹⁷ Putnam (1998b), p. 75. Thomas (1983), p. 180, points out the uniqueness of the situation at Carthage, where the principal onlooker (Aeneas) sees himself portrayed in the work of art. Here, too, Vergil achieves uniqueness in the representation.

¹⁸ Galinsky (2009), p. 74, points out that although *templa* (6.19, 41) may be construed as plural for singular, two temples did exist there from around the fifth or sixth century BCE.

¹⁹ Galinsky (2009), p. 72; see also pp. 74, 80.

²⁰ Maiuri (1932), reproduced in Maiuri (1983); Fletcher (1941/66), pp. 50-2, additional note on 1-264; McKay (1967); Schoder (1970 and 1971/2); Clark (1977a,b); McKay (1984); Galinsky (2009); Horsfall (2013), p. 103, note to 6.43, expresses 'extreme reluctance' to identify Maiuri's *dromos* with the Sibyl's cave, elaborating his reasons at pp. 77-8, §13.

the Trojan War, in which he recognizes several of the principal characters, including himself (1.488). Conversely, the images on the shield are all forward-looking, revealing selected events which will inform the future development of the Roman people and the Julian clan, which Aeneas has already unwittingly founded. The Daedalus ekphrasis, however, has no explicit connexion with Aeneas or his descendants, and looks both backwards and forwards in time.

At the same time, a marked difference in structure is perceptible between the Daedalus ekphrasis and the others. Within each of the other two passages, the text permits a number of discrete tableaux to be seen by viewers-in-the-text and visualized mentally by viewers-outside-the-text: after an introductory summary, seven more detailed scenes in the Carthage murals;²¹ and sixteen, after a brief preamble, on Aeneas' shield.²² Putnam divides the Daedalus ekphrasis into five well-defined sections according to the verbal description of the text.²³ Because of a difference between what may have been presented to the eyes of the Trojans and what is made manifest to the reader, however, Putnam's segmentation of the text does not correspond to individual scenes visible to the Trojans. Some scholars have nevertheless postulated a specific arrangement of the images on the doors. Norden, in particular, discerns four panels, two on each door, with a scene possibly at Marathon above a scene at Athens on one door, and on the other door Pasiphaë and the Minotaur in one panel above the labyrinth in another.²⁴

Notwithstanding any attempted reconstruction, individual tableaux which are supposedly visible to the Trojan viewers become difficult for readers to pick out after the initial scenes in Attica showing the death of Androgeus (6.20) and the victims being selected by lot (6.20-2). Events in Crete selected for mention by the poet and depicted, as it would appear, on the door-leaf facing the Athenian scenes (6.23), are described at slightly greater length (five rather than three lines), but begin to blur. Indeed, through the enumeration of people and events, suggesting motion and activity in a medium which is necessarily static, a continuous impressionistic narrative emerges at 6.28 (albeit with significant lacunae) in place of a representation of individual sculpted panels. Whilst the two and a half lines beginning at 6.28 could be taken as describing an additional image, they actually evoke an emotion (*miseratus*) which, unlike the

²¹ Putnam (1998b), Chapter 1 [= *idem* (1998a)].

²² Putnam (1998b), Chapter 5.

²³ Putnam (1998b), pp. 77-82.

²⁴ Norden (1927), p. 122, note to 6.14 ff.; accepted by Zarker (1967), p. 221.

poet's generic exclamation *miserum* at 6.21, is specifically attributed to Daedalus (both by the poet and, by implication, probably also by the Trojans).²⁵ Thus the text becomes more fluid as it begins to change focus towards Daedalus' emotions, firstly his pity for others, then his own personal grief. As Fitzgerald observes, 'the frieze is described as a finished work of art, but ... it becomes the narrative of Daedalus, unfrozen and released into history'.²⁶

Impressionism in the text and exclusion of the death of Icarus from the 'record', to which omission Vergil draws particular attention, do not necessarily mean that the sculptural decoration of the doors was unfinished. Moreover, that the 'record' suffers from omissions does not imply that any area was left undecorated.²⁷ Indeed, that the Trojans are inclined to peruse everything thoroughly (6.34) before Achates arrives with the Sibyl may indicate that more was available to view, and may be interpreted as indicative of completion.²⁸ In consequence, the reader is permitted and perhaps even required to attempt to imagine what other scenes the Trojans may have been able to see on the doors.²⁹ Speculation as to what other panels the artist may have completed, however, is beyond the scope of this chapter, whereas what the artist proved unable to depict, and the possible reason why that was so, will be discussed later. Supporting the structural differences noted above, the vocabulary of the Daedalus passage, with a marked preponderance of Greek names, together with the location on the Bay of Naples, close to the earliest known Greek colony on the Italian mainland at Cumae, creates a suitable atmosphere in keeping with the archaic and mythological subject matter.³⁰ This location, furthermore, would resonate with Romans as the place of origin of the Greek books of oracular utterances which, according to legend, were acquired from the Cumaean Sibyl by Tarquinius Superbus. The sometimes staccato style of this passage is also significantly different from that of the other two major ekphraseis, as is the apostrophe which concludes the ekphrasis, and the way in which important characters

²⁵ The effect of the lines from 6.28 to mid-6.30 may be considered analogous to modulation between keys in music, where the transitional passage is compatible both with the key the music is leaving and with the destination key.

²⁶ Fitzgerald (1984), p. 54.

²⁷ *Contra* Galinsky (2009), p. 74, and Seider (2013), p. 188, with n. 91, both suggesting that the last panel on the temple doors was left blank.

²⁸ This would seem to be the assumption in Casali (1995), where further content is postulated (see next note), although nothing subsequent to the arrival of Daedalus at Cumae. Putnam (1998b), p. 81, in speaking of 'artistic incompleteness' need not be implying that part of the doors remained undecorated, although he makes no explicit comment.

²⁹ Casali (1995), pp. 3-4, argues with considerable plausibility that the principal subject of the series of images on the doors is the story of Theseus and Ariadne rather than the autobiography of Daedalus. The intertextual relationship of this passage with Catullus *Carmen* 64 (discussed below) would seem to support this view.

³⁰ See note 6, *supra*, concerning the Euboean colony at Cumae.

are left unnamed and referred to only obliquely. As Eleanor Winsor Leach observes, ‘the visual rubrics of this ekphrasis are the most elliptical of all three in the poem.’³¹

Turning briefly now to the minor ekphrasises of works of creative art in the *Aeneid*, they have something in common with the Daedalus passage in so far as they depict stories from the remote, unmistakably mythological past, and involve to a greater or lesser extent horror and situations of danger, deception and violence. Cloanthus’ cloak (5.250-7), awarded for his victory in the ship race, portrays the abduction of Ganymede,³² while Turnus’ arms (7.785-92) portray the chimaera on his helmet and the metamorphosis of Io on his shield.³³ Pallas’ baldric (10.497-9) portrays the story of the Danaids.³⁴ Each of these (except Turnus’ helmet) has been analysed in some depth by Putnam, but all are short, and they do not therefore have the complexity and multiple chronological planes exhibited by the Daedalus ekphrasis. Indeed, in each instance, concrete description is directed primarily at the reader, with no internal viewer specified. Moreover, the demands placed upon the reader are slight, limited to recognizing the particular myth and, in the case of the last mentioned, to understanding the dreadful significance in the context.

4.3 The mythological past

The images displayed on the temple doors relate explicitly to events purporting to have taken place during the time of King Minos. Although in the chronology of epic, that period is only approximately a century earlier than the time of Aeneas,³⁵ it is nevertheless perhaps even for the Trojans an epoch of at least semi-mythology. On the one hand, within the context of the *Aeneid*, what the Trojans see are real, tangible images. At a remove of only one hundred or so years, therefore, the Trojans might possibly have recognized Daedalus as a real historical character who had fled from a real historical civilization, and (in the absence of an inscription) they might perhaps have worked out that the images were sculpted by the artist as a thanks offering to the

³¹ Leach (1999), p. 119.

³² Putnam (1998b), Chapter 2 [= *idem* (1995a)].

³³ Gale (1997); Putnam (1998b), Introduction, pp. 18-22, discusses only the shield, not the helmet.

³⁴ Putnam (1998b), Chapter 6 [= *idem* (1994)].

³⁵ Herodotus states (7.171.1) that Minos died two generations before the Trojan War; consistent with *Iliad* 13.450-3, where Idomeneus, whom Aeneas must have known, if only by repute, cites Minos as his grandfather. (Idomeneus is mentioned at *Aeneid* 3.122, 401, 11.265). So, adding ten years for the war and seven for Aeneas’ wanderings, as well as allowing for some years prior to Minos’ death, Daedalus’ flight must have taken place at least 80-90+ years before the Trojan arrival at Cumae which, on the basis of Jupiter’s pronouncement to Venus at 1.265-77, Vergil places in the late twelfth century BCE. Modern scholarship, of course, dates the height of the civilization named after Minos some centuries earlier.

god for safe arrival at Cumae. On the other hand, some of the content of those images, such as men flying with artificial wings (if portrayed), might have stretched Trojan credulity. Furthermore, whether indeed the Trojans were able to construct a coherent story from the images at all is impossible to know, for Vergil does not here indicate any recognition or comprehension on their part, nor even wonder, except in so far as they would have lingered over the images had they been allowed to do so. Vergil himself may also be indicating a degree of scepticism, for immediately after the sudden introduction of the new subject he states that he is reporting what others have said (*Daedalus, ut fama est*: 6.14), thereby pointing to other sources whilst simultaneously distancing himself from them. Indeed, Servius suggests in a number of places that Vergil uses the formula '*ut fama est*' or similar, such as '*ut perhibent*', when relating something uncertain or mythical.³⁶ Vergil's narrative here does not, in fact, correspond with other surviving sources, which in any event are not themselves entirely in agreement.³⁷

At the beginning of the story depicted in the golden images, the death of Androgeus, immediately introduces the themes of horror and death which will continue throughout the ekphrasis.³⁸ As Michael Paschalis observes, this death triggers the subsequent 'sad chain of violence' through to the death of Icarus.³⁹ More particularly, Androgeus' death also establishes the theme of the loss of a child by a parent, which will recur in the deaths of the *Cecropidae*, the Minotaur, and Icarus. For the death of his son, Minos (referred to only obliquely through an adjectival mention at 6.14) takes disproportionate revenge which involves the labyrinth and his monstrous step-son imprisoned and concealed therein.

The labyrinth then becomes the next focus of the story. Constructed by Daedalus to mitigate a problem for which he carried a considerable degree of responsibility as facilitator, the labyrinth itself subsequently becomes a new problem for him to solve.

³⁶ Servius on 4.179: '*quotienscumque fabulosum aliquid dicit, solet inferre "fama est"*'; cf. also Servius on 3.578 and on the Daedalus ekphrasis at 6.14.

³⁷ Diodorus Siculus (*Βιβλιοθήκη ιστορική*, 4.77.8-9) provides an account of the myth of Daedalus' escape from Crete using artificial wings, stating that he landed in Sicily; alternatively, Servius (note to 6.14) says that Sallust gives Sardinia as Daedalus' first landfall, although definitive confirmation is not provided by such fragments as survive: Maurenbrecher (1893), p. 64, Fragment 2.7; Kurfess (1957), p. 181; McGushin (1992), p. 46, Fragment 2.9.

³⁸ How Androgeus died is not mentioned. Various versions may have been known to Vergil, such as: Diodorus Siculus *Βιβλιοθήκη ιστορική* 4.60.4 (murdered at the behest of Aegeus); Hyginus *Fabulae* 41 (death in battle). Servius, in his note to 6.14, states that Androgeus was murdered by jealous Athenians and Megarians. Readers are left to conjure up their preferred version (or not). Providing detail here would, however, have detracted in general from the main focus of the passage and in particular from the staccato rhythm of the text at this point.

³⁹ Paschalis (1986), p. 41.

Yet, the labyrinth is not mentioned explicitly until quite late in the ekphrasis, and then only periphrastically with the no doubt intentionally ponderous *inextricabilis error* (6.27). Confined within the labyrinth is the Minotaur, a carnivorous, hybrid monster (*mixtumque genus prolesque biformis*, 6.25), which recalls to mind other strange beasts, often hybrid, found earlier in the poem, and also heralds others which will feature later. During the Trojans' brief stop at the Strophades in the Ionian Islands, they are molested by the bird-women Harpies (3.209-62). Some time afterwards, all four vessels which contend in the ship race bear the names of hybrid animals, namely *Pristis*, *Chimaera*, *Centaur*, and *Scylla* (5.116-22). The hybrid monster Scylla had already been referred to at 1.200 when Aeneas is referring to previous dangers the Trojans have faced, and is mentioned along with Charybdis by Helenus in his admonitions to Aeneas (3.420, 424, 432), in consequence of which the Trojans change course twice to avoid these hazards (3.561-2, 684-6). This double threat lurking in the Straits of Messina is recalled once more in Juno's angry tirade at 7.302.

Meanwhile, during their first visit to Sicily, the Trojans had heard from Achaemenides about Odysseus' tragic adventure with the monster Polyphemus (3.616-48), but they do not have a first-hand encounter, seeing him and other Cyclopes only from a safe distance (3.655-81). In Book 7, the hydra is portrayed on the shield of Aventinus (7.658), and the image of a fire-breathing chimaera recurs on Turnus' helmet (7.785-6) in the preliminary part of the short ekphrasis of his arms.⁴⁰ Later, while visiting Evander, Aeneas is also told the story of how Hercules killed Cacus (8.194-261), a fire-breathing hybrid man-monster who, described as *semihominis* at 8.194 and *semiferi* at 8.267, is reminiscent of the *biformis* Minotaur. One further significant reference occurs later in the text, also linking to the Daedalus ekphrasis, namely mention of the enchantress Circe, whom Vergil describes as *daedala* (7.282). Not a monster herself, Circe is capable of turning men into beasts, and happens to be a (half-)sister of Pasiphaë.⁴¹ As such, mention of Circe constitutes a reminder of yet another danger which, thanks to Neptune, the Trojans bypass on the last stage of their Odyssean voyage up the coast of Italy (7.10-24).

⁴⁰ Gale (1997).

⁴¹ Pasiphaë is mentioned as daughter of the sun-god by: Apollonius Rhodius, *Ἀργοναυτικά* 3.999; Hyginus, *Fabulae* 40. Circe is mentioned as daughter of the sun-god by Apollonius Rhodius, *Ἀργοναυτικά* 3.309-11, 4.682-4; *Odyssey* 10.135-9, where Perse is cited as mother. Cicero, *De natura deorum*, 3.48, and Diodorus Siculus, *Βιβλιοθήκη ἱστορική*, 4.60.4, agree on the sun-god as father of both, but the former cites the sea-nymph Perse as mother, the latter Crete, daughter of one of the Curetes.

Aeneas will also see other beasts and monsters on the threshold of the Underworld (6.285-9), along with abstract afflictions such as Fear and Need. Others will appear after the crossing of the Styx, notably Cerberus (6.417), the Fury Tisiphone (6.555, 571), and the Titans (6.580-4). Indeed, such horrendous creatures are to be expected in areas where punishment is meted out to those who have committed serious crimes in the world of the living (6.431-3).⁴² It is the monsters in the upper world, however, as potential threats to Aeneas and his followers, which carry greater importance for the present discussion. Of the mostly hybrid beasts described as living in the upper world, the only ones with which the Trojans have any direct contact are the Harpies, an encounter which is employed to deliver the prediction that the Trojans will suffer extreme hunger and have to eat their tables (3.255-7). Moreover, none of the upper-world monsters resides on the mainland of Hesperia/Ausonia which is destined to be the Trojans' new *patria*. The last such monster living there, Cacus, had been killed by Hercules roughly a generation before the arrival of the Trojans.⁴³

Curiously, two important characters associated with the age of Minos are not named in Vergil's description of the temple images, even though it seems more than likely that at least one of them, if not both, must have featured in the temple sculptures visible to the Trojans. Of these two characters, Theseus is not mentioned at all, whilst Ariadne is only alluded to through the unusual, but not unprecedented, application to her of the word *regina* with the meaning of princess.⁴⁴ Using their 'privileged' knowledge of the myth and of earlier Greek and Latin literature, informed readers will, of course, supply these names. In particular, the most observant readers will notice an interesting complementarity between Vergil's description of Daedalus' images with the ekphrasis in Catullus' *Carmen* 64. The two ekphraseis complement each other in terms of their respective narratives, which have very little overlap. Vergil does not describe the death of the Minotaur, which Catullus had already done in a vivid simile (64.105-11). Conversely, Catullus had made no explicit mention of Daedalus, but after the slaughter of the Minotaur focused particularly upon the desertion of Ariadne by

⁴² Minos, as one of the judges in the Underworld, is recalled to the reader's mind at 6.432, together with reference to his *urnam* as a tool of judgment, recalling the *urna* of 6.22.

⁴³ According to Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautika*, Hercules was amongst the Argonauts when they sailed (1.122), so belonged to the same generation as Achilles' father Peleus, also an Argonaut (1.90-4).

⁴⁴ OLD2E (2012), Vol. II, p. 1762, s.v. *regina* §1b. Servius on 6.28: '*regis filiae, Ariadnes*'. Taking the different view, Otis (1964), p. 284, asserts that Daedalus gave the thread to Pasiphaë so that it 'could lead her to her terrible offspring'; *ibidem*, n. 1 states that 'the whole passage refers to her [*sc.* Pasiphaë]', rather than to Ariadne. Segal (1965), p. 643, also suggests that *regina* alludes to the 'love-sick' Pasiphaë. Similarly, Miller (1995), p. 232. Horsfall (2013), pp. 96-7, note to 6.28, discusses and strongly rejects the possibility that *regina* may refer to Pasiphaë.

Theseus, which is omitted by Vergil. Hence, a sort of interlocking, poetic symbiosis exists between the Catullan and Vergilian ekphraseis, reflected in the incompleteness, through the omission of the death of Icarus, of the series of images on the temple doors. Two close verbal correspondences confirm this relationship. Catullus' reference to Ariadne's thread, *errabunda regens tenui vestigia filo* (64.113) is echoed by Vergil's *caeca regens filo vestigia* (6.30), while Catullus' description of the windings of the labyrinth as *inobservabilis error* (64.115) at the end of a line is echoed by Vergil's *inextricabilis error* (6.27), also at the end of a line and with the same metrical rhythm in the last three feet.⁴⁵

In summary, therefore, by evoking the menace associated with the labyrinth, especially the cannibalistic Minotaur, Vergil has drawn attention to hybrid monsters and similar inhuman beasts of the mythological age which were a danger to ordinary mortals and which are brought to the minds of readers at several earlier and later points in the poem. At the same time, however, even though portentous reminders of the monsters of the mythological past recur in the second half of the *Aeneid*, Vergil has consigned either to the remote past or to other lands or to both all such creatures which might have constituted a future danger for the Trojans. Monsters therefore remain symbolic, and are thus in their physical form banished from the events which will unfold in the late twelfth-century Latium of the *Aeneid*, where the real future dangers to be faced by the Trojans are human. Although banished, however, the shadow of danger cast metaphorically by the labyrinth and by the recurring representation of monsters will continue to hang over the Trojans during the rest of the poem. Indeed, as will be seen, analogous overtones and associations encapsulate symbolic menaces both in the Trojan present and the Augustan future.

4.4 The Trojan present

How the Trojans may have responded to the images on the temple doors is impossible to know, particularly since the reader is not informed of everything the Trojans see. Moreover, unlike the other two major ekphraseis, this one is not accompanied by any description of reactions by the internal viewers, except that the Trojans were evidently sufficiently interested to have continued viewing had not Achates returned with the Sibyl (6.34-6). It cannot even be certain that the Trojans were aware of the (hi)story of Daedalus, unless the *fama* referred to in the opening line

⁴⁵ 6.27: *inēxtrīcābīlīs ērrōr*; Catullus 64.115: *inōbsērvābīlīs ērrōr*.

of the ekphrasis had already reached their ears.⁴⁶ Nevertheless, even if the Trojans were entirely ignorant, images probably conveying the ideas of escape and distance travelled might well have caused them to identify with Daedalus as a fugitive who was forced to undertake a difficult journey in order to escape (*fugiens Minoia regna*: 6.14). Similarly, images of the Athenian youths who wandered hopelessly in the labyrinth and died after encountering the terror of the hybrid monster might well have engendered some empathy amongst those who had wandered for many years and had seen fellow exiles die. What the Trojans certainly could not have recognized, however, is the equivalence of the deadly significance of the Minotaur for the *Cecropidae* with the threat posed to the *Aeneadae* by Turnus, whom they have not yet encountered. The images of the hybrid chimaera on Turnus' helmet and of Io, only partially metamorphosed and therefore hybrid, on his shield are confirmation of this forward link.⁴⁷

For the informed reader, however, with the benefit of Vergil's allusions and dramatic irony, there are other associations and resonances with the past and future experiences of the Trojan fugitives. Immediately, the very location of the story represented brings back to mind the ill-fated sojourn of the Trojans in Crete (3.130-91), when they suffered from a sudden, terrible plague (3.137-42).⁴⁸ Crete is 'a byword for deviation', and above all, the labyrinth is 'one of the most powerful symbols of digression, deviation, and confusion within the *Aeneid*'.⁴⁹ With its convoluted paths and the danger enclosed therein the labyrinth symbolizes the wanderings and the hazards which the Trojans have faced and will yet face. It has also been suggested that the labyrinth symbolizes the Underworld, which Aeneas is shortly to visit.⁵⁰ Yet, unlike the Underworld experienced by Orpheus with its sinuous river Styx (*Georgics*, 4.478-80), the Underworld in the *Aeneid* is bicursal (Tartarus/Elysium), not multicursal or maze-like.⁵¹ Moreover, since Aeneas' progress therein is essentially linear, the connexion is not direct. By extension, however, given that entry to the labyrinth is irreversible, entailing certain death for all who enter (except for a select few), the

⁴⁶ The story could have been brought to Troy by Minos' grandson, Idomeneus, and then somehow percolated across to the Trojan side.

⁴⁷ Gale (1997), p. 177: 'Io is depicted at the very moment of metamorphosis'.

⁴⁸ Catto (1988), p. 74, points out that the Trojans' stay on the island does not appear in other extant versions of the legend, thereby underlining the significance of Crete in Books 3 and 6.

⁴⁹ Armstrong (2002), pp. 329 and 328 respectively.

⁵⁰ Otis (1964), p. 284, with n. 2; Rutledge (1971/2), p. 113; Williams (1972), pp. 459-60, note to 6.1ff; Armstrong (2002), p. 338. In an interesting psychological interpretation, Hejduk (2011), pp. 100, 103, identifies the labyrinth not only with the Underworld, but also with Aeneas' soul, the Minotaur therein being Dido (p. 96).

⁵¹ On similar grounds, Horsfall (2013), p. 88 §(13) rejects the comparison of the labyrinth with the Underworld, although previously Horsfall (1995), p. 150, had given some support to the idea.

labyrinth as a symbol of death, and indirectly therefore of the Underworld, is more convincing.⁵² Association with the Trojans' wanderings and the hazards is reinforced by the appearance of the words *error* and *labor*, both at 6.27. The former evidently links back to Dido's first use of the word (1.755) to refer to the wanderings of the Trojans, but in addition to this sense, the word also speaks of deception and danger, as for example in Laocoön's unheeded, prophetic words concerning the wooden horse: *aliquis latet error* (2.48). Another obvious link looks back to the *lusus Troiae*, where the words *et inremeabilis error* at the end of 5.591 correspond closely to *et inextricabilis error* at the end of 6.27 as the complex manoeuvres of the Trojan youths are compared in a simile to the labyrinth rumoured (*fertur*: 5.588) to have existed in Crete in earlier times (5.588-93).⁵³ The words of 6.27 also constitute a forward-looking intratextual link to the *non enarrabile textum* of the shield ekphrasis, again at the end of a line and with the same metrical rhythm in the last three feet (8.625).⁵⁴ Indeed, it is in the simile used for the *lusus Troiae*, too, that Vergil uses the word *labyrinthus* (5.588) for the only time in the *Aeneid*, hinting at the potential horrors and dangers of war implicit in the peaceful equestrian exercises carried out essentially for entertainment in the context of the commemorative games. In the Daedalus ekphrasis, on the other hand, Vergil does not use the word, since the names and the location remove the need to do so, drawing upon the presumed knowledge of the reader.⁵⁵ Nevertheless, the connotations of the labyrinth are just as negative and foreboding in the Daedalus ekphrasis as when explicitly applied to the *lusus Troiae*.⁵⁶

As with *error*, the semantic field of the word *labor* also embraces a large negative area. Although in 6.27 *labor* may be taken as referring literally to the product of Daedalus' artistic skill (*hic labor ille domus* – here [on the sculpted panel] that work-product of the palace), the second half of the line (*et inextricabilis error*) strongly indicates that a more sinister interpretation is called for simultaneously. Moreover, these first four words of 6.27 look ahead to the Sibyl's sombre words summarizing the difficulty of returning from the Underworld at the beginning of 6.129: *hoc opus, hic*

⁵² Catto (1988), p. 72, suggests that 'Troy is the labyrinth from which Aeneas first escaped'.

⁵³ *inremeabilis* at 5.591 links in turn to the same word used of the Styx at 6.425.

⁵⁴ 6.27: *inēxtrīcābīlīs ērrōr*; 8.625: *non ēnārrābīlē tēxtūm*; 5.591 is slightly different: *īnrēmēābīlīs ērrōr*.

⁵⁵ Doob (1990), p. 31: 'so unspeakable are the labyrinth's causes and contents that its very name remains unspoken'.

⁵⁶ *Contra* Doob (1990), p. 30, where it is suggested that the reference in Book 5 is 'very much a labyrinth *in bono*', by contrast with the reference in Book 6, which she sees as 'the labyrinth *in malo*'; this interpretation does not mesh well with other negative undercurrents which exist beneath the surface of the happy atmosphere of the commemorative games. Armstrong (2002), p. 335, recognizes that the *lusus Troiae* is 'overshadowed by the memory of the dark Cretan past'.

labor est. Daedalus' strenuous effort may have constructed a work of genius, but at the same time this darker significance of *labor* foreshadows suffering, entailing 'a struggle with difficulties, toil, hardship',⁵⁷ as enunciated in the well-known aphorism from *Georgics* 1.145-6: *labor omnia vicit | improbus*.⁵⁸ This more sinister meaning of *labor* is also easily found elsewhere in the *Aeneid*. Given the large number of mentions of *labor* in the *Aeneid*, a few examples must suffice.⁵⁹ As early as 1.10, the word is used to indicate the trials which Juno will cause Aeneas to undergo, with the same import shortly afterwards when spoken by Venus to Jupiter at 1.241 (*quem das finem ... laborum*). At 3.714, Aeneas refers to the death of his father as his last hardship (*hic labor extremus*) before reaching the African shore. Towards the end of the poem, the word is also used of others who suffer, Juturna at 12.635, and Turnus at 12.727 when Jupiter finally weighs his fate in the balance (*quem damnet labor*).

Several of the individuals who feature, named and unnamed, in the ekphrasis allude to or symbolize characters encountered by the Trojans during the course of the poem. Few of these connexions are likely to have gained recognition even by the most perceptive Trojan viewer, especially where they are evoked by specific vocabulary which only the reader is in a position to recognize. As eminent fugitives, Daedalus and Aeneas can easily be linked together.⁶⁰ Since Daedalus' flight is from a situation largely of his own making, however, the link may be not so much with Aeneas fleeing from Troy as from his own aberration at Carthage. Both men may therefore also be thought to be linked by some degree of guilt.⁶¹ After suffering tragic losses, however, both arrive safely in Italy. While Daedalus builds a temple to Apollo at Cumae, Aeneas vows to build a temple for Apollo (6.69) after the Trojans have settled in Latium. At the same time, Pasiphaë's unspeakable passion (*Veneris ... nefandae*: 6.26) recalls Dido's ill-fated passion, since both liaisons have disastrous consequences. Indeed, Dido's passion is brought back to the attention of the reader particularly through the words *magnum reginae ... amorem* (6.28), where the word *regina* alludes to Dido whilst also referring obliquely to Ariadne and/or Pasiphaë, as discussed above.⁶² Owen Lee

⁵⁷ OLD2E (2012), Vol. I, p. 1091, s.v. *labor* §6.

⁵⁸ Thomas (1988a), Vol. 1, p. 93, note to *Georgics* 1.145-6, construes as: 'Insatiable toil occupied all areas of existence'. See also his discussion on pp. 16-24.

⁵⁹ Goins (1993), p. 375, states that there are 73 mentions of *labor* in the *Aeneid*, almost always with 'a connotation of hardship and sorrow'; cf. also Wiltshire (1984), p. 5, who sees *labor* as referring most frequently in the *Aeneid* 'to suffering, to hardships, to trials and the works of war'.

⁶⁰ Casali (1995), p. 4 n.4, denies this association unsuccessfully.

⁶¹ Although the nature of their guilt is different: Daedalus as a facilitator, Aeneas as a perpetrator.

⁶² Norden (1927), p. 129, note to 6.28 emphasizes the distinction between the *nefanda Venus* of Pasiphaë and the *magnum amor* of Ariadne, but in the latter instance the word *reginae* inevitably also points to Dido.

also suggests, albeit not entirely convincingly, that in Crete the bull was sacred to Neptune, and suggests therefore that Cretan sea power 'is meant to stand for the sea power, Carthage'.⁶³

Perhaps the most significant connexions concern two of the unnamed characters. As already mentioned, Ariadne's part in the story (although not necessarily in the sculpted images) is alluded to in the text, albeit through the unusual, but not unprecedented, application to her of the word *regina* with the meaning of princess. Similarly, Theseus' rôle is acknowledged silently, despite Vergil's omission of the slaying of the Minotaur from the description of the images on the door. Nevertheless, Theseus is associated with Aeneas who will be slayer of Turnus representing the danger awaiting the Trojans later in the poem. Both Theseus and Ariadne may well have featured in some way in the images viewed by the Trojans, even though Vergil attributes to Daedalus the sole credit for having solved the problem of egress from the labyrinth through the use of a thread (6.29-30), without any mention of Ariadne as agent. Readers, of course, are potentially aware of the full story, if only through knowledge of Catullus' *Carmen* 64, but their privileged knowledge is apt to cause them to jump further than may actually have been portrayed on the temple doors. If the series of images focuses on Daedalus' flight to Italy following his imprisonment after the elopement of Theseus and Ariadne, then the subsequent abandonment of Ariadne may not have been portrayed. Yet, readers who are left without explicit guidance as to how much further (if at all) the series of images may go are likely to conjure up those events in their imagined view, especially given the already mentioned complementarity of Vergil's description of Daedalus' images with the ekphrasis in Catullus 64. As a consequence, readers will be disposed not only to equate Theseus with Aeneas but also the deserted Ariadne with the abandoned Dido. Verbal echoes underscore this association, for both Ariadne and Dido are described, with similar phraseology placed at the end of lines, as smitten or wounded (respectively: *saucia cura*, 4.1; *saucia curas*, 64.250). Both women also, in their invectives, accuse their erstwhile lovers (each apostrophized as *perfide*: 4.366; 64.132, 133) of having been nurtured by wild animals (respectively: *tigres*, 4.367; *leaena* 64.154).⁶⁴ By combining silence and reference to the earlier poet, therefore, Vergil stimulates responses to images which may not have been sculpted on the doors.

⁶³ Lee (1992), pp. 84, 85.

⁶⁴ Armstrong (2002), pp. 330, 332, concerning *saucia*; Casali (1995), p. 6, with n. 7, concerning the wild animals and other resonances.

Another thematic association which the Trojans are unlikely to have perceived (at least to its full extent) and would not in any case have appreciated completely is that of parents (not quite exclusively fathers) and sons. Several such relationships feature in the story conveyed by the series of sculpted images, specifically Minos and Androgeus, the Athenians and the *Cecropidae*, Pasiphaë and the Minotaur, and Daedalus and the blatantly absent Icarus. In all of these cases the relationship is terminated in tragic circumstances when the younger individuals meet their end. All of these link back to previous premature deaths, starting with the sons of Laocoön (2.213-5), but especially the deaths of sons of Priam, notably Polites (2.526-32), and other young warriors in the sack of Troy, while looking ahead to many more in the later books. Although Ascanius necessarily survives beyond the end of the *Aeneid*, the linking of Daedalus and Aeneas as fugitive fathers foreshadows premature death, not for Aeneas' own son, but for his surrogate son Pallas and several other youthful individuals who are associated with Aeneas as *Aeneadae*.⁶⁵ This patronymic is not infrequently applied in the poem to followers of Aeneas, labelling them as his 'children', just as the Athenians are referred to as 'children' of their mythical ruler Cecrops.⁶⁶ Lee has suggested that the deaths of the seven victims sent annually to Minos by the Athenians (*septena quotannis | corpora natorum*: 6.21) correspond to and evoke the deaths of seven specific 'surrogate sons' of Aeneas, of which the first six are paired, viz: Palinurus and Misenus, Nisus and Euryalus, Pallas and Lausus, and Camilla [*sic*].⁶⁷ Although interesting, this interpretation is forced in relation to the last two, whom it is impossible to accept as *Aeneadae*.⁶⁸ Amongst characters linked in the ekphrasis by, *inter alia*, a parent-child relationship, unnamed exceptions also stand out in stark contrast, Ascanius/Iulus, the only son who survives, and Anchises, the only father other than Aeneas not bereaved, but who himself dies.

The glaring absence from the series of images of Daedalus' own son, Icarus, may have caused some bewilderment if the Trojans knew the legend. If they did, they are

⁶⁵ Hejduk (2001), linking Tiber and Numicus (Chapter 2, especially pp. 50-2), suggests that Aeneas' own death is presaged in a number of places in the *Aeneid*. It is difficult to see it in the Daedalus passage, except to the extent that, like the death of Icarus, Aeneas' death is, in Hejduk's words (p. 93) 'watery', since he dies in or near the Numicus (Servius' notes to 1.259, 4.620, 7.150, 7.797, and 12.794).

⁶⁶ The term *Aeneadae* is used 18 times in the poem; of particular importance in the passage under discussion is the evident interchangeability of *Cēcrōpīdāē* (6.21) and *Ānēādāē*.

⁶⁷ Lee (1992), in which he further suggests that the seven sons correspond to 'seven suffering heroines', also evoked by the ekphrasis and seen in the *Lugentes Campi* of the Underworld (6.445-8), namely, Phaedra, Procris, Eriphyle, Evadne, Pasiphaë, Laodamia, and Caeneus, the last mentioned, having also been a man, intended to correspond to the female warrior Camilla.

⁶⁸ Better perhaps would have been to have included Polites (2.526-32) and Deiphobus (6.509-30) or even Polydorus (3.55-6), to all of whom Aeneas was related through his marriage to Creusa.

likely to have supplied the omission from their own imaginations. Informed readers, on the other hand, are privileged to know of Daedalus' inability to portray his son's death. While supplying the omission in their own minds, they will probably wish to reflect on the significance. Within the Trojan time-frame, associations will be made with the loss of other sons mentioned earlier in the poem, several of whom have already been mentioned above, as well as surrogate *Aeneadae* mentioned later in the poem. At the same time, the evidently close bond between Daedalus and Icarus is likely also to recall the close relationship between Anchises and Aeneas, which is emphasized when the latter complains that he is unable to embrace his father's ghost (*quis te nostris complexibus arcet?* 5.742). In this instance, however, the loss is inverted, with the son losing his father (*genitorem ... | ... amitto Anchisen*: 3.709-10).

All of these associations constitute further links which reach both backwards and forwards in the text.

4.5 The Augustan 'future'

In the course of the Daedalus ekphrasis, various associations are also made relating to the Augustan age, that is, Vergil's own present, which in the context of the *Aeneid* is more than one thousand years in the future. Of course, the Trojan observers cannot appreciate these connexions. Vergil therefore relies solely on his readers to recognize and interpret the references.

At the beginning of the ekphrasis, the location of the events portrayed hints at the fact that Cnossus was already a 'has-been', the ancient site having been abandoned in favour of a new *colonia* (see discussion in Chapter 2.5). By contrast, the consecration by Daedalus of a temple to Phoebus Apollo at Cumae then immediately brings to mind the new Temple of Apollo, Augustus' patron, built by the *Princeps* close to his own house on the Palatine and dedicated in 28 BCE in fulfilment of a vow he had made in 36 BCE during the campaign against Sextus Pompeius.⁶⁹ At some date after 31 BCE, the temple also became associated with Actium, whether through popular usage, or Augustan propaganda, as Carsten Lange argues, or through Vergilian invention.⁷⁰ Either way, the Daedalus ekphrasis may be interpreted as looking ahead to the later ekphrasis of Aeneas' shield. In that ekphrasis, Augustus is portrayed as sitting at the

⁶⁹ Velleius Paterculus, 2.81.3; *Res gestae divi Augusti*, 19.

⁷⁰ No certainty exists concerning the date when this association originated. Lange (2009) has a useful discussion of the issue (pp. 166-8), concluding (p. 196): 'Virgil's *Aeneid* and Propertius 4.6 did not invent this connection, but instead supported the claims made by the regime'.

threshold of the temple (8.720), and Apollo himself is present at the battle and is instrumental in the achievement of victory (8.704-6).

Given that Aeneas can often be associated with his putative descendant Augustus in their rôles as founder and refounder respectively of the Roman nation, then some link between Daedalus and Augustus may seem to be indicated. Such a connexion is favoured by Rutledge, who sees metaphorical links between Daedalus' construction of the Temple of Apollo at Cumae, Aeneas' creation of a nation in Italy, and Augustus' establishment of a new world-order in Rome.⁷¹ Horsfall, however, dismisses the association of Daedalus and Augustus as 'altogether unconvincing'.⁷² Nevertheless, some support for this idea is to be found in the vow made by Aeneas to dedicate a temple to Apollo (6.69-70), reflecting the similar vow made by Augustus, referred to above, and thus linking also to Daedalus' temple.⁷³ Furthermore, not only do Daedalus and Augustus, like Aeneas, survive, but both mourn the loss of a beloved family member, respectively Icarus and Marcellus (see below).

More apparent is the association of Pasiphaë with Cleopatra, for the two queens are linked through the same vocabulary as links Pasiphaë with Dido: *Veneris monimenta nefandae* (6.26) and *magnum reginae ... amorem* (6.28). Both phrases recall the Egyptian queen's 'illicit' liaison with Mark Antony. The association of Pasiphaë with Cleopatra also looks ahead towards the portrayal of Cleopatra on the shield of Aeneas (*Aegyptia coniunx*: 8.688; *regina*: 8.696, 707). Moreover, the description of her there as *Aegyptia* and the presence on the shield a few lines later of *omnigenumque deum monstra et latrator Anubis* (8.698) conjure up associations of animal worship, Egyptian hybrid gods, and improper sexual relations, thereby confirming the link with Pasiphaë.

Alongside Cleopatra, it would be surprising not to find Antony. If, therefore, Cleopatra is closely identified with Pasiphaë, then readers may be tempted to see Pasiphaë's bull as Antony with his *ope barbarica* (8.685). Indeed, elsewhere in Vergil, bulls are portrayed as animals prone to be driven by passion and *furor*. At 12.103-6 a simile describing Turnus' fury as he prepares for battle (*his agitur furiis*: 12.101) reproduces two lines (bar one word) of *Georgics* 3.233-4, where a bull is preparing to fight its rival for a second time. These two bulls had actually met and fought for the

⁷¹ Rutledge (1967), pp. 310-1.

⁷² Horsfall (2013), p. 88, §16.

⁷³ Schoder (1971/2), p. 100, points out that Augustus also rebuilt the temples at Cumae, 'probably on Vergil's urging'.

first time earlier in the *Georgics* (3.220-23). Reversing the sequence in the *Georgics*, however, where the description of the bulls' battle precedes a description of their preparations, the bull simile describing Turnus' preparations at 12.103-6 precedes a second bull simile describing the fight between Turnus and Aeneas at *Aeneid* 12.715-22. Through the bull imagery, together with the *furor* and the enmity, therefore, there is ample justification for seeing Antony associated with Turnus.

As a future threat to the Trojans, however, Turnus has already been linked with the Minotaur (see Section 4.4 above, headed 'The Trojan present'). Less convincingly, therefore, it is possible that some readers may be inclined to associate Antony with the Minotaur. If so, the Minotaur lurking as a potential threat to the *Cecropidae* in the labyrinth of an eastern kingdom (Crete in the time of King Minos) may perhaps be taken as emblematic of the perceived threat which Antony, demonized as a Roman-Egyptian hybrid, represented for the *Aeneadae* of later generations. Here, then, the individuals perceived as the single most serious threat to peace and order in their respective time-bands (Turnus and Antony) may possibly be the subject of a double association in the mythological time-band, both with the Cretan bull and with its hybrid offspring, the Minotaur. If some readers should find this apparent duplication problematical, however, a purely figurative interpretation also exists, namely that the metaphorical offspring of the bull, like that of *furor*, is death and destruction. Faced with a range of possible associations, which may be alternative, or coexistent and complementary, readers may elect one or more of the available interpretations.

Just as, in the fictitious present of the Trojans, Icarus is seen as representing the tragic loss of many younger people, so for the Augustan age he may also be seen as representing one particular premature death, namely that of Marcus Claudius Marcellus, Augustus' nephew and son-in-law, who had died unexpectedly in late 23 BCE at the age of only nineteen. Like Icarus, who is apostrophized by the poet near the beginning of the book (*tu quoque* | ... *Icare*: 6.30-1), Marcellus is addressed directly by Anchises in the Underworld, near the end of the book (*tu Marcellus eris*: 6.883). Once again, the importance of family ties is highlighted. As Horsfall observes, 'the two tragedies [of Icarus and Marcellus] "bracket" the book, clearly enough'.⁷⁴ In Chapter 5 of this thesis, I also argue, furthermore, that the extraordinary splendour of the funeral accorded to the relatively unknown warrior Misenus should be seen as effectively dedicated to Marcellus. Accordingly, the premature death of this young man is lamented three times

⁷⁴ Horsfall (2013), p. 89, §18.

in the course of Book 6, once in each of the chronological strata (as Icarus, as Misenus, and as himself), the book thus serving to a considerable extent as a commemorative tribute *in memoriam Marcelli*.

4.6 Self-referential and metapoetic elements

In the Daedalus ekphrasis, appropriately located metaphorically in the Temple of Apollo as patron god of music and poetry, Vergil refers not only to himself and his own poetry, but also to poetry and creative art more widely, transcending chronological boundaries. An equivalence is suggested between Daedalus, as a creative genius capable of soaring above the earth, and creators in general and Vergil in particular. Once again, the temple constructed by Daedalus is significant. Not only does it refer to Augustus' Temple of Apollo Palatinus in the real world, as mentioned above, but it may also be read as linking back to the metaphorical temple of marble which Vergil promised that he would build on the banks of the river Mincius near his birth-place Mantua (*Georgics* 3.13-16), and which constitutes the declaration of his intention to embark on a more substantial epic poem.⁷⁵ This link is confirmed intertextually by the use of the words *in foribus* at the beginning of 6.20 to introduce the description of the panels on the doors of Daedalus' temple, echoing exactly the same words, also at the beginning of a line, which introduce the description of the sculpted images on the doors of Vergil's metaphorical temple (*Georgics* 3.26).⁷⁶

In broader metapoetic terms, Putnam sees the progressive development of the ekphrastic narrative as reflecting Vergil's poetic career from the '*ambages* of pastoral' to the 'greater openness and practicality of didactic' and thence to 'the poetry of *dolor*'.⁷⁷ Putnam also suggests that the ekphrasis reflects the tripartite division of the *Aeneid*, as it passes from Daedalian deception (as in his artefacts) in *Aeneid* 1-4, through pity (as for the queen, whether Pasiphaë or Ariadne) in *Aeneid* 5-8, to *dolor* (as in grief for the loss of Icarus) in the last four books.⁷⁸ Worth noting in addition, however, is that there is also a more literal correspondence of the Daedalus ekphrasis to the first half of the *Aeneid*, for the ekphrasis traces symbolically the story of Aeneas, a man who like

⁷⁵ Thomas (1988a), Vol. 2, p. 36, introductory note to *Georgics* 3.1-48; Harrison (2005), pp. 185-8, suggests that this *Georgics* passage also refers to the *Mausoleum Augusti*, which had recently been completed and where the body of Marcellus had been laid to rest

⁷⁶ *Georgics*: Thomas (1988a), Vol. 2, p. 44, note to 3.26; *Aeneid*: Conington/Nettleship (1884), p. 429, note to 6.20; Austin (1977), p. 42, note to 6.20.

⁷⁷ Putnam (1998b), p. 83; previously, Putnam (1995c), p. 79, had 'availability' instead of 'practicality'; the revised version is clearer.

⁷⁸ Putnam (1998b), pp. 86-90.

Daedalus is forced to become a fugitive, who in his search for a new home faces the horrors represented by hybrid monsters, who is responsible for many wanderings in the metaphorical labyrinth and witness to many premature deaths, and who after a lengthy journey ultimately reaches a safe destination, but burdened with grief as a result of the very great personal cost in human terms. Writing about ekphrasis in the *Aeneid* in general, Putnam suggests that it may in some ways be seen as ‘a synecdoche for the poem as a whole’.⁷⁹ This particular ekphrasis illustrates his point well in relation to the first half of the epic. Doob goes even further, suggesting that 6.27 (*hic labor ille domus et inextricabilis error*) is ‘a phrase that effectively paraphrases the whole poem’.⁸⁰

Horror, premature death, and grief, which pervade this ekphrasis, combine together powerfully in its culmination with the highly emotional apostrophe to Icarus (6.30-1). As a father, Daedalus is too overwrought to be able to express his extreme grief through his art, the fatal fall of his son (*casus*: 6.32) being reflected by the artist/father’s hands falling not once, but twice (*bis patriae cecidere manus*: 6.33). Moreover, Daedalus’ failure is strongly emphasized by the abrupt ending of the ekphrasis with the words *cecidere manus* in the middle of the line. This failure, however, is not unique to this one artist. At this point, Daedalus’ emotions are taken over with great empathy by the poet himself. Moreover, Icarus here can be interpreted as being both specific to Daedalus and generic, indicating any subject of acute, intense grief which may affect any artist, not just Daedalus. Artistic creativity may therefore be prone to limitations when certain topics are too painful to permit expression in the artist’s chosen medium. In his analysis, Putnam has adopted this view, expressing it as the ‘end of art’, but takes the idea rather too far when he suggests that ‘this distress results in his [Daedalus’] inability to create at all’.⁸¹ After all, the temple-doors are decorated after Daedalus has safely landed following the death of Icarus. Shortly after his arrival, therefore, Daedalus’ artistic inspiration is still sufficient to sculpt several panels before he seeks to address himself to representing the loss of his son. When he makes that attempt, he discovers the boundary of his artistic ability, beyond which he

⁷⁹ Putnam (1998b), Conclusion, p. 209; also *ibidem* p. 205 [= *idem* (1994), p. 187], concerning the Danaid ekphrasis (10.495-9); *ibidem*, p. 61 [= *idem* (1995a), p. 425] makes a similar point concerning the Ganymede ekphrasis (5.250-7).

⁸⁰ Doob (1990), p. 237.

⁸¹ Putnam (1998b), p. 82; similarly, Segal (1965), p. 644: ‘this failure of Daedalus, this futility of the artist to convey what is closest to him’.

personally cannot go, but that does not necessarily mean that he was incapable of depicting other scenes subsequently (which he may possibly have done).⁸²

Despite direct personal intervention by the poet, however, this generic artistic limitation need not necessarily be taken as self-referential, even if the text may be interpreted as suggesting that other creative artists in addition to Daedalus may also come up against a barrier which for them is insurmountable. Possibly, Vergil may be exhibiting some anxiety here as an author, along with his evident empathy with Daedalus. In the event, however, Daedalus' failure provides for Vergil's success, since the latter manages to convey poetically what Daedalus cannot achieve in plastic art, thereby, as Putnam observes, 'bringing Icarus and his father's frustrating grief before us in the permanence of words'.⁸³ Furthermore, while Daedalus fails completely to depict this one particular event, readers are in no position to know whether Vergil himself experienced such failure. Indeed the *Aeneid* does not lack scenes of deep pathos, most particularly the deaths of young men. Whether Vergil is successful in evoking sympathetic emotional responses to the horrors of the *labores* which the Trojans endure in their travels and in the war is largely a matter for the individual reader. Nevertheless, his occasional funereal apostrophes and the words which he places in the mouth of major characters are highly effective in evoking great sadness amongst his readers. A few examples will suffice. *Tu quoque ... Caieta* at 7.1-2, followed by a funerary epigram echoes the *Tu quoque ... Icare* of 6.30-1, with similar tragic import. Elsewhere, Vergil's apostrophe to Nisus and Euryalus (9.446-9) offers the pair long-lived fame in the poet's own composition. Other obvious examples include deeply emotional words placed in the mouth of Aeneas, such as his much-quoted, tearful utterance at 1.462 (*sunt lacrimae rerum*), and his reaction to the death of Lausus, whom he has just killed, commencing *ingemuit miserans graviter* (10.823), and continuing with his address to the dead young man (10.825-30). Anchises' apostrophe to Marcellus (6.883: *manibus date lilia plenis*) is also noteworthy for its communication of deep sorrow, which is alleged to have particularly deeply affected Octavia, Marcellus' mother and Augustus' sister.⁸⁴

⁸² In support of this view: Paschalis (1986), p. 36: '... that Daedalus fails as an artist because he is unable to represent the death of Icarus on the temple-gates is questionable'.

⁸³ Putnam (1998b), p. 81.

⁸⁴ Brugnoli & Stok (1997), p. 32 (*Vita Donatiana e vita Suetoniana desumpta*, §32), pp. 98 (*Vita quae Donati aucti dicitur*, §47).

4.7 Synthesis

In the previous sections, I have sought to unravel Vergil's intertwined chronology in the Daedalus ekphrasis. To do so, I have analysed and discussed individual components within the boundaries of each distinct era, while also showing how other manifestations belonging to the same chronological strands are to be found at various other places earlier and later within the poem. Accordingly, it is obviously appropriate now to reintegrate the elements of the passage in order to demonstrate how the time-bands are woven together by thematic links. As will be shown, most of these thematic links extend across all three chronological bands. Sometimes, however, the rationale linking the first and the second time-bands may be slightly different from the rationale linking the second and the third time-bands. In consequence, although a link between first and third bands may be suggested, it may occasionally be relatively weak.

Premature death, especially slaughter actually or metaphorically *ante oculos ... et ora parentum* (2.531), has been encountered in each of the individual time-bands, and is a unifying theme, also connecting parents and their children, both across the time boundaries and throughout the poem. Androgeus, the *Cecropidae* and Icarus all die young (as, indeed, does the Minotaur) and link across time to Pallas and the *Aeneadae*, as well as to Turnus. Moving further across the chronological boundaries, Marcellus is also linked to all of the above.⁸⁵ Separately, clear links, including those related to loss of a close family member, associate Daedalus with Aeneas, and Aeneas with Augustus.⁸⁶ The corollary which suggests a linking of Daedalus with Augustus is, however, weaker, posited essentially upon temple construction and bereavement. Also to be included, however, is the Anchises-Aeneas relationship, which inverts the usual pattern through the death of the father. Parents here are also connected in a metaliterary sense with Vergil himself, as author, whose creativity links him firmly in any event to Daedalus. Unlike human progeny, however, who perish quickly and are mostly forgotten, a poet's literary output is capable of surviving millennia. Here, the labyrinth constitutes an additional unifying factor. Daedalus was the architect. For each of the other time-bands, however, a metaphorical connexion is embedded in the *labores*

⁸⁵ Excluded from this group of premature deaths are Dido, Cleopatra and Antony, since they do not die young, are not mourned by an older figure, and are all suicides. Nevertheless, given that their lives ended before their expected span – *nec fato, merita nec morte ... sed ... ante diem* (4.696-7) – some readers may see a connexion.

⁸⁶ Minos may be included here, too, as a father grieving for Androgeus. More questionable, but not to be excluded completely, is the possibility that Pasiphaë would have mourned the death of the Minotaur, a logical conclusion based upon Otis (1964), p. 284, n. 1: 'It is but human that she [Pasiphaë] should want to see her terrible child'.

represented by the labyrinth, namely, for Aeneas the trials endured in his peregrinations and in war, for Augustus the political struggles and civil wars from 44-31 BCE, and for Vergil the artistic and intellectual effort demanded of him by the volume and complexity of his poetry.

A further set of individuals linked across the time-bands brackets together women who entered into relationships deemed to be in some way inappropriate, Pasiphaë, Dido, and Cleopatra. Ariadne, whose love for Theseus was not sanctioned by her father, may also be added to the group. Furthermore, Ariadne, Dido, and Cleopatra were all deprived of their respective lovers through abandonment, the last-mentioned being forsaken as a result of Antony's suicide. Dido and Cleopatra also die by their own hands.⁸⁷ Threats to posterity unite another small but important group, the Minotaur, Turnus, and Antony, each of whose deaths was perceived by their adversaries to be necessary for the purpose of ensuring the safety of others. Lastly, less creditable actions also link the two 'heroes' who liberated the world from the threats to posterity represented by the Minotaur and Turnus. Theseus' abandonment of Ariadne reflects Aeneas' abandonment of Dido.⁸⁸ Later, Vergil portrays Theseus as enduring eternal punishment in the Underworld (6.617-9).⁸⁹ Theseus is condemned to a permanent sedentary state for his part in another, similarly dubious, amorous enterprise in which he and Pirithous had aimed to abduct Proserpina. By analogy, however, the judgment which Vergil inflicts on Theseus in modifying the usual version of the abduction attempt also effectively indicts Theseus' counterpart in the *Aeneid*.⁹⁰

Some scholars have sought to identify a single or principal unifying theme in the Daedalus ekphrasis. For example, Paschalis has focused upon the central figures of the Minotaur and Daedalus.⁹¹ Similarly, Segal has indicated that Daedalus' subjects are 'crime, guilt and especially polluted and unhappy love'.⁹² All of these do, of course, feature, but it must nevertheless be apparent that the chronological complexity of the passage is matched by the multiplicity of themes which run through the ekphrasis.

⁸⁷ According to Catullus, Ariadne also contemplates imminent death: *extremo tempore* (64.169); *ostentant omnia letum* (64.187).

⁸⁸ Some may possibly also consider that Augustus' abandonment of Scribonia completes the trio. Whether those who fostered subversive ideas during the Augustan principate perceived and enjoyed the latter connexion is impossible to know.

⁸⁹ Servius states (note to 6.617) that, in the more usual version of the legend, Hercules rescued Theseus from the Underworld. Williams (1972), p. 497, note to 6.617-8, points out that the 'normal' version is implicit at 6.122.

⁹⁰ The usual version of the abduction legend, involving the release of Theseus by Hercules is related by Diodorus Siculus (*Βιβλιοθήκη ιστορική*, 4.26.1 and 4.63.4, with slight variations).

⁹¹ Paschalis (1986), especially p. 38.

⁹² Segal (1965), p. 643.

Outstanding amongst these themes are premature death, parenthood, the labyrinth, inappropriate relationships, abandonment, threats to posterity, and conquering heroes who behave irresponsibly in their amorous adventures. All these are intertwined in the three-tiered chronological nexus. Consequently, although narrative time is put on hold for a short while, the Daedalus ekphrasis is not a mere delaying device, as both Heinze and Norden had suggested,⁹³ but makes a significant overall contribution to the poem. In considering these three chronological eras, it is also interesting to reflect that while they are only ‘visible’ to the reader in the Daedalus ekphrasis, they become fully visible to Aeneas in the Underworld. His progress there takes him past mythological beasts, including the Chimaera, Gorgons and Harpies (5.285-9), then through his immediate past in reverse order (Palinurus, 6.340; Dido, 6.450; Deiphobus 6.495), and finally to the vision of the future Roman heroes (6.756-885).⁹⁴

While looking at the Daedalus ekphrasis as a unit integrated within the poem as a whole, it is interesting also to consider the passage in the light of Fowler’s seminal article analysing the nature and dynamics of ekphrasis within a narrative context.⁹⁵ Three approaches to the opposition of ‘narrative’ and ‘description’ are isolated in Fowler’s article. Because of its impressionistic and allusive nature, however, as well as the lack of strong reaction by internal viewers, the Daedalus ekphrasis is more difficult to categorize than the other major ekphraseis in the *Aeneid*. The passage cannot truly be said to contribute ἐνάργεια by bringing the scene before the eyes of the reader in any literal sense. Nor does it really continue the narrative through description which involves reaction from internal participants or observers. On the other hand, the contribution of this ekphrasis is evidently on what Fowler refers to as the ‘psychological level’, in which ‘because ekphrasis represents a pause at the level of narration and cannot be read functionally, the reader is possessed by a strong need to interpret’.⁹⁶ Fowler’s later observation is also pertinent: ‘all art depends for its interpretation on the competence of the viewer’.⁹⁷ Laird, too, has postulated three conclusions concerning the relation between art (whether real or imagined) and text, based on the ekphraseis of *Aeneid* 1 and 8 and Propertius 2.12 and 2.31.⁹⁸ If these conclusions are applied to the Daedalus ekphrasis, however, it stands out as clearly different. Firstly, Laird states that

⁹³ See note 4 in this Chapter.

⁹⁴ Otis (1964), p. 289, has a useful diagram of the Underworld which illustrates Aeneas’ progress, although in his segmentation of the Underworld (p. 282) he includes the encounters with Palinurus, Dido, and Deiphobus in his ‘Mythological Hades’.

⁹⁵ Fowler (1991). Goldhill (2007), p. 1, n. 2, refers to Fowler’s article as ‘standard and much-cited’.

⁹⁶ Fowler (1991), p. 27.

⁹⁷ Fowler (1996), p. 61.

⁹⁸ Laird (1996), pp. 99-101.

all of the works he discusses ‘give special and explicit prominence to the role of the [internal] viewer’. He stresses that the shield and the temple pictures are ‘emphatically focalised through Aeneas’. This is not at all true, however, of the Daedalus passage. Secondly, while it is true that the text can only provide one version of the art work, the Daedalus ekphrasis does not offer the same level of pictorial detail found in the other two major ekphraseis. Absence of such detail makes it difficult for the reader to create a distinct mental picture of the temple doors. Thirdly, what cannot be denied is that describing art is itself an art form. Indeed, Vergil has provided outstanding proof of this maxim, not through the richness of his descriptive detail, but by relying upon the reader to make connexions and recognize multiple associations.

In an analysis which predates Fitzgerald, Putnam, Fowler, and Laird, duBois rightly perceives this ekphrasis to be pivotal and suggests that Vergil ‘uses mythology here, as a “history” outside time’.⁹⁹ She does not, however, penetrate the full complexity of the intertwined chronologies and while linking Aeneas closely with Theseus and noting the importance of father-son relationships, she does not pursue other links to any extent. When the Daedalus ekphrasis is viewed as a whole, it is clear that the chronological bands are intertwined in such a way as to create an integrated, complex whole. In an extremely compact unit consisting of only nineteen and a half lines, links lying below the surface of the text connect each individual time period with each of the others. Important themes of the *Aeneid* and the major characters involved in it are intermingled, and the links exploited for poetic effect. Episodes and individuals from myth and history are manipulated to reflect events which have taken place in the previous books of the *Aeneid* and to adumbrate what will happen both in the rest of the poem and in the real Augustan ‘future’. Vergil breaks down chronological boundaries, thereby highlighting the repetitiveness of history, as issues of earlier eras foreshadow those of his own time.

4.8 Conclusion

Vergil’s Daedalus ekphrasis stands out from the other ekphraseis in the *Aeneid* through its condensed brevity, through its stylistic contrasts, through its weak internal focalization, and through featuring the artist who, with possibly autobiographical purpose, has executed the sculptures and who also corresponds metapoetically to the poet himself. By employing a number of literary devices, notably allusion,

⁹⁹ duBois (1982).

intertextuality and intratextuality, Vergil does not so much describe as evoke the sculpted images which the Trojans see on the temple doors at Cumae. No reaction on the part of the Trojan viewers is mentioned, nor is the totality of what they see vouchsafed to the reader. Moreover, the point of view is almost entirely that of the poet himself, only briefly projected on to Daedalus, as description modulates (or in more colloquial parlance, morphs) smoothly into narrative – not the narrative of the poem, nor even the narrative of the sculpted images, but the narrative of an artist at a critical point in the execution of his art. Yet Vergil successfully challenges the power of images since his verbal ekphrasis is as richly endowed with associations to stimulate the reader's imagination as a graphic representation. In the ekphrasis, static images are transformed into dynamic history, while numerous themes of Vergil's own work which run backward and forward throughout the whole poem like threads are simultaneously interwoven and linked across the boundaries of three distinct chronological eras. The mythological past and the Augustan 'future' are never far away from Aeneas' fictitious present. Above all, by connecting the mythological past which constitutes Daedalus' present to Aeneas' poetic present and to his own real present in the Augustan age, Vergil sweeps away chronological boundaries.¹⁰⁰ Paradoxically, the combination of multiple chronological bands creates an effect of timelessness, for the poet highlights the relativity of time, and demonstrates that little changes, and that certain characteristics of history persist, notably human suffering. In doing so, Vergil manipulates his material by making significant modifications to the Daedalus legend, moving the scene from Sicily or Sardinia to the location of the Trojans' first landfall on the Italian mainland. Important themes, such as danger and mortality have been emphasized through the symbol of the Cretan labyrinth and its history, as well as the theme of parent-son relationships, and the terrible consequences of 'unspeakable love'. At the same time the metaliterary parallels of Daedalus and Vergil as creative artists point up the stresses which Vergil, too, has undergone in addressing the suffering which he necessarily has to portray at almost all stages in the course of his poem. His success, however, confirms that in doing so his hands do not fail him in the way that Daedalus' hands do.

Structurally, the Daedalus ekphrasis occupies the middle ground between the longer ekphraseis of the Temple of Juno and the shield of Aeneas. Its multiple chronologies balance the backward-looking ekphrasis of Book 1 and the forward-

¹⁰⁰ Feeney (1991), p. 131, describes a similar effect in opining that 'Juno's hate fixes the time of the poem's action in its own limbo between myth and history'.

looking ekphrasis of Book 8. Hence, as descriptive text which conceals multiple analeptic and proleptic references to the principal narrative against a complex chronological background, the Daedalus ekphrasis can be seen within the *Aeneid* as a whole as a ‘Knotenpunkt’ located at a critical turning point in the narrative.¹⁰¹ At the first landing place on the Italian mainland, the Odyssean part of the epic comes to an end and the Iliadic part is about to begin. The change pivots around Aeneas’ visit to the Underworld and the events at Cumae which prepare him for the visit. In the Underworld, Aeneas is to see mythical monsters and explicit reminders of the history he has lived through, as well as the parade of heroes which will provide glimpses of the future of the Roman people, glimpses which will mystify but encourage him. As part of the prelude to Aeneas’ visit, the Daedalus ekphrasis provides encoded reminders of themes and events which occurred earlier in the poem, as well as links forward to the recurrence of those themes and to events to come later in the poem. As such it constitutes a cameo uniting themes and individuals which inform the poem as a whole.¹⁰² Readers are required to think in order to comprehend the full significance of the elements of the ekphrasis, while the Trojans, like Aeneas watching the parade of heroes, can only understand the external form which is displayed before them.

In the conclusion of his monograph on Vergilian ekphraseis, Putnam states incontrovertibly that ‘there is a multidimensional aspect to Virgilian ekphrasis’, and further observes that ‘Ekphrasis of works of art, in Virgil’s hands, also more often than not implies a multiplicity of interpretive perspectives’.¹⁰³ Hence, Fitzgerald’s spatial-historical interpretation and Putnam’s own interpretations of ekphrasis as synecdoche as well as, in this instance, a reflection of Vergil’s poetic evolution, coexist comfortably with a reading based upon a complex intertwining of chronologies.

¹⁰¹ Rather than English terms such as junction or intersection, the German word ‘Knotenpunkt’ seems better to express the plurality of thematic strands which from this point in the text reach backward and forward.

¹⁰² Catto (1988), p. 76, suggests that the labyrinth is ‘a symbol which unites and summarizes the first six books’; but it is not just the labyrinth, but the ekphrasis as an entity which performs this function and looks forward, too.

¹⁰³ Putnam (1998b), p. 209, and also similarly at p. 214.

5. Misenus Aeolides: the (almost) unknown warrior

Why is it Misenus whom Vergil chooses to die shortly after the Trojans make their first landfall on the western Italian mainland at Cumae?¹ Who, indeed, was he? Moreover, what are the purpose and function of the episodes in Book 6 of the *Aeneid* in which first his death and then his funeral are related? Notwithstanding the pedigree accorded to him by Vergil at 6.164-70, on closer examination Misenus turns out to be something of a mystery character. He is virtually unknown within the context of the *Aeneid*, and little about him can be gleaned from other extant sources. Examination of his supposed Vergilian genealogy and his literary forebears leads to no definitive outcome. Scholarly comment has not been plentiful and is dispersed amongst works which concentrate on other characters or topics. Contributions have tended to focus on his evident parallelism with the more prominent Vergilian character of Palinurus and the Homeric character of Elpenor,² on topographical aetiology,³ and on comparison of his funeral with that of Patroclus in Book 23 of the *Iliad*.⁴ Yet one fundamental question seems not to have been thoroughly investigated, namely, why Misenus? Bearing in mind, Lyne's maxim, 'Nothing in Vergil is without purpose or explanation',⁵ we should be moved to enquire why Vergil chose an unfamiliar character as the subject of an elaborately described Roman funeral, the only funeral for an individual which is described in almost complete detail in the whole of the poem.

I propose in this chapter, therefore, to address this and related questions. In order to do so, I shall examine Vergil's treatment of the whole of the Misenus episode, with a view to identifying narratorial and other reasons for the choice. Accordingly, I shall look at (i) the intertwining of Misenus with the characters of Palinurus and Elpenor, (ii) Misenus' background and genealogy, (iii) other funerals in the *Aeneid*, (iv) the similarities which Misenus' funeral exhibits in comparison with *Iliad* 23 and other models, (v) the differences from earlier models, and (vi) metapoetic and symbolic aspects. In concluding, I shall also revisit the interpretation of Neptune's prediction(s) at 5.814-5. Although the discovery of Misenus' body (6.156-84) and the execution of

¹ In modern geographical terms, they had already landed in Italy previously, at Castrum Minervae in Iapygia (now Apulia), but not in the western land of Hesperia or Ausonia.

² Williams (1960), p. xxviii.

³ McKay (1967); Clark (1977a).

⁴ Fletcher (1941/66), pp. 47-8, note to 6.234.

⁵ Lyne (1989), p. 167.

his subsequent funeral (6.212-35) embrace and provide the occasion for the episode of the Golden Bough (6.185-211), for the present purpose I shall exclude the passage concerning its discovery, since it warrants separate attention in the context of the scenes involving the Sibyl (see Chapter 6.4).

5.1 Discovery of Misenus' body

Only 150 lines after Aeneas' valedictory epigram for Palinurus, the Sibyl announces somewhat abruptly that one of Aeneas' comrades lies dead in an unspecified place and is a source of pollution for the whole fleet which must be attended to forthwith:

praeterea iacet exanimus tibi corpus amici

(heu nescis) totamque incestat funere classem (6.149-50)

In doing so, the Sibyl uses precisely the same verb (*iaceo*) as Aeneas had used in his unwittingly proleptic lament, uttered in the last line of Book 5:

nudus in ignota, Palinure, iacebis harena (5.871).

The sadness here is enhanced by recalling other similar words, which are also placed in the mouth of Aeneas, but refer to Priam:

iacet ingens litore truncus (2.557)

Most striking here, in all three places quoted, is the use of the same verb, *iaceo*. Moreover, the locations specified (*harena, litore*) and the mention of the fleet, the sterns of which border the beach (*litora ... | praetexunt*: 6.4-5), not only hint at where the corpse will be found, but also refer to yet another corpse which lay on the shore in Homeric epic, namely Patroclus.⁶

κεῖται παρ νήεσσι νέκυς ἄκλαυτος ἄθαπτος (*Iliad* 22.386)

a corpse lies near the ships, unlamented, unburied

In Book 2 of the *Aeneid*, the words quoted also carry an evident allusion to the murder, less than a generation earlier, in 48 BCE, of Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus, whose decapitated body was left on the beach at Alexandria.⁷ Hence, the tragedy of the death of Misenus is elevated to an even higher level through association with no fewer than

⁶ Horsfall (2013), pp. 164-5, §1(a).

⁷ Caesar, *De bello civili*, 3.104.1-3; Plutarch, *Pompey*, 19.3-80.2; Cassius Dio, 42.4.4-5.

three illustrious men from previous epic or recent history (Priam, Patroclus, Pompey), who all met a violent end. Additionally, as will be discussed later, this elevation of the tragedy of Misenus contributes to a further association with an even more recent event, which gradually becomes apparent as the Book unfolds, namely the death of Augustus' nephew and son-in-law, Marcus Claudius Marcellus in late 23 BCE. At the same time, for the attentive reader/listener, the Sibyl's words will also recall the pollution which seemed to present a bad omen for the Trojans as they departed from Carthage:

quae tantum accenderit ignem

causa latet; duri magno sed amore dolores

polluto, notumque furens quid femina possit,

triste per augurium Teucrorum pectora ducunt. (5.4-7)

Purification from past pollution, as well as from the more immediate pollution from the corpse is an important aspect of the Misenus episode to which I shall return later.

In view of the words spoken by the Sibyl at 6.149-50, a first-time reader is likely to assume that the body of Palinurus must have been washed up somewhere on the shore.⁸ Indeed, the currents along the west coast of Italy (as well as the favourable wind provided by Neptune) make this entirely plausible.⁹ Curiously, Aeneas and Achates do not make this assumption, for they are portrayed as perplexed and said to be discussing who the unfortunate man could possibly be (6.160-1). Heinze does not consider their perplexity strange, stating that since, according to his interpretation, Palinurus died in the sea far from Cumae such a thought would be far from their minds, despite the fact that in Heinze's own chronology the discovery of Misenus' body occurs only one day after the fleet left Drepanum.¹⁰ Horsfall offers a different perspective, asserting that 'readers with a decent knowledge of mythol. geography ... will have worked out who it was'.¹¹ Nevertheless, given the heart-felt lament for Palinurus at the end of Book 5 and the small amount of intervening text, it is scarcely plausible that readers' memories could be so defective, nor that Aeneas and Achates could have forgotten Palinurus so

⁸ Lee (1997), p. 50; Hejduk (2001), p. 82. Williams (1972), p. 469, note to 6.149, after conceding that the reader's first thought might be of Palinurus, suggests that 'this idea is dispelled by the phrase *heu nescis*'; similarly, Horsfall (2013), Vol. 2, p. 167: 'Clearly Palinurus could not have been meant', also based upon the *heu nescis* in 6.150. If, however, *nescis* is taken to refer not to the adjective *exanimus* but to the verb *iacet*, the question raised in the mind of the reader's lingering memory of the tragedy of Palinurus is 'where?', rather than 'who?'.

⁹ Arnaud (2005), pp. 24-5 concerning the currents in the Tyrrhenian Sea.

¹⁰ Heinze (1915), p. 452 n. 1: 'es lag gewiß der Gedanke nicht nahe'; p. 341 for chronology.

¹¹ Horsfall (2013), Vol. 2, p. 175, note to 6.162.

soon after the tragic event.¹² The effect of their perplexity, however, is that what seemed ‘obvious’ at first to the reader is quickly called into doubt by the narrative. As a consequence, for a few more lines the reader is left in the dark like Aeneas and Achates, a good example of what Oliver Lyne calls ‘incitement’, inducing the reader to look for the solution at a later point in the text.¹³ Vergil thus causes the reader to share the perplexity of the two Trojans, albeit for different reasons. This brief confusion is occasioned by what may be interpreted as a sort of literary prank, in which the reader is ‘wrong-footed’, so to speak, and set up to be surprised when the truth is revealed. Despite the solemn subject, it becomes possible to discern, on the second and subsequent readings, one of the few instances of humour to be found in the *Aeneid*, a very brief leavening of the tone before a tragic discovery.¹⁴ When Aeneas and Achates then almost immediately come across the body of Misenus on the beach (6.162-3), the puzzle is resolved to the surprise of both Trojans and reader. Yet even here, the information that Misenus is dead is delayed until the last two words of line 163, thereby eking out the mystery to the last possible moment. Paradoxically, this confusion constitutes the first occasion when the characters of Palinurus and Misenus become linked, apparently erroneously, in the mind of the reader. Yet this linkage is not erroneous at all, since Vergil continues to associate the two characters through literary allusion.

5.2 Misenus and Palinurus, and links with Homer

Besides the initial linking of Misenus and Palinurus, various other reasons have also caused these two characters to be referred to by scholars in the same metaphorical breath, sometimes using the word ‘doublet’.¹⁵ Firstly, as will be demonstrated below, both men derive to a greater or lesser extent from the Homeric character of Elpenor. Secondly, the names of both characters (to be followed not long afterwards by Caieta’s) are predicted to survive for all time.¹⁶ Indeed, their burial places mark the progress of the Trojans up the western coast of Italy, providing aetiologies for topographical

¹² Even if the elapsed time were nearer 72 hours than 24, as suggested by Palinurus’ own testimony (6.355-7).

¹³ Lyne (1989), p. 176, who then adds: ‘and the solution is a surprise’.

¹⁴ On humour in Vergil, see MacLennan (2011).

¹⁵ Hubaux (1933), p.150; Knight (1944), pp. 291-2, (1966) pp. 352-3; Williams, R D (1960), pp. xxvii-xxviii, in which, however, he differentiates the two characters and stresses their separate existence; Segal (1965), pp. 645-6; McKay (1967), p. 7; Thaniel (1972), p. 149.

¹⁶ In identical words: Palinurus: *aeternumque ... nomen* (6.381); Misenus: *aeternumque ... nomen* (6.235). Caieta slightly different: *aeternam ... famam* (7.2).

features of the mainland which are still known by the same names today, viz: Capo Palinuro and Capo Miseno, both in the modern-day Italian region of Campania. Thirdly, both characters suffer tragic, premature deaths along the sea-shore of Campania, Palinurus murdered by tribesmen, Misenus drowned. Common links between these characters help to underline the essential continuity of the latter part of Book 5 and the first third of Book 6 as steps in the build-up towards Aeneas' descent to the Underworld. They are reinforced by the opening lines of Book 6 (*Sic fatur lacrimans*), which, echoing the structure of the openings of Book 7 of the *Iliad* and Book 13 of the *Odyssey*,¹⁷ tie the end of Book 5 securely to the beginning of Book 6 by closing (for the time being) the episode of Palinurus and bringing the voyage from Drepanum to Cumae to a successful conclusion. These are amongst factors contributing to the first part of what Stratis Kyriakidis has described as the 'frame' of Book 6.¹⁸ The second part of the 'frame' has some similarity with the way Book 5 had previously run on into Book 6, for in the last three lines of Book 6 the Trojans arrive at the port of Caieta (6.899-901), while Book 7 opens immediately with the death of Aeneas' nurse Caieta (7.1-4).¹⁹ Through a number of patent similarities, Caieta's death links back to both Book 5 and Book 6, recalling to the reader's mind the deaths of Palinurus and Misenus. Like the two Trojans who predeceased her, Caieta is a minor character, not having been mentioned even once previously in the poem, except obliquely by the mention of the eponymous port at 6.900. Similarly, the account of her death comes suddenly, she is lamented and addressed directly in epigrammatic form,²⁰ and she will enjoy *aeternam ... famam* (7.2). Most importantly, however, her burial place provides the aetiology for what is nowadays the provincial capital of Gaeta in the region of Lazio, a further marker of the progress of the Trojans up the western coast of Italy.

As indicated above, the characters of both Misenus and Palinurus are modelled to some extent on Elpenor. Although neither maps exactly to the Homeric character, the story of each draws upon aspects of character and/or situation which are similar to those found in the three Odyssean scenes in which Elpenor appears (*Odyssey* 10.552-60, 11.57-78, 12.8-15). For the purpose of comparison an overview of the areas of similarity is best presented in a simple table, as follows:

¹⁷ Demonstrative adverb + verb of speaking, regarded by most commentators (e.g. Williams (1972), p. 460, note to 6.1-2) as a strong indicator that lines 6.1-2 are correctly placed and do not belong at the end of Book 5. The two lines in question also reproduce almost exactly *Iliad* 1.357: ὥς φάτο δάκρυ χέων.

¹⁸ Kyriakidis (1998).

¹⁹ See also fuller discussion of book divisions in Chapter 1.4, with Table 1.

²⁰ She is given the signal distinction of being apostrophized by the poet himself (7.1-2) in a particularly prominent position in the text, *Tu* being the first word of the book, whereas it is Aeneas who addresses Palinurus (5.871) and Misenus (6.189).

Table 5: Similarities between Elpenor and Palinurus and Misenus		
Elpenor	Palinurus	Misenus
Lonely death	Y	Y
Death results from own negligence/foolishness	Y(?)	Y
Recent death, not immediately noticed	Y	Y
Body lies unburied for a while	Y	Y
First to speak in the Underworld	Y	N
Buried by his own comrades	N	Y
Story told in more than one part	Y	Y
Story spans more than one book	Y	N
Oar placed as grave-marker	N	Y

When all the relevant features are viewed together in this way, the stories of Palinurus and Misenus both have significant elements in common with the story of Elpenor. Equally clear, however, is that only one element in each instance constitutes the conclusive link between the Vergilian and Homeric characters: for Palinurus the meeting in the Underworld, and for Misenus the oar on his grave. In each case, also, the definitive fact (the ‘clincher’, in more colloquial usage) is held back until the concluding part of their stories. Hence, the allusions to Elpenor probably only dawn on the first-time reader quite late, so he/she is effectively invited to think back over or re-read the stories in order fully to appreciate the particular Homeric resonances, another example of Lyne’s Vergilian ‘incitement’. Additionally, a further Homeric link which binds Palinurus and Misenus with Elpenor involves Caieta, whose death has already been mentioned as serving to remind readers of the deaths of these two comrades of Aeneas. Recalling that the story of Elpenor is narrated across three books of the *Odyssey*, Horsfall observes that ‘the tripartite Homeric Elpenor ... is reworked into the *tripartition* of Palinurus, Misenus, and Caieta, with some help from another Trojan nurse, Naevis’ Prochyta’.²¹

²¹ Horsfall (2013), p. 164, §1(a). The italics are Horsfall’s.

It is also evident from reading the passages relating to Palinurus and Misenus that the former is much more engaged in the events of the first half of the epic and is also the more fully drawn character. Palinurus has appeared several times earlier in the *Aeneid* (3.202, 513, 562, 5.12), portrayed as an important individual whom Aeneas respects for his navigational knowledge and his judgment. Indeed, in Book 3 it is Aeneas himself, as internal narrator, who extols Palinurus' skills. Aeneas also implicitly acknowledges Palinurus' authority in his particular area of expertise, for at 3.519 it is Palinurus who, on the basis of his recognition of favourable sailing conditions, initiates the departure from somewhere in the vicinity of the Ceraunian mountains (in modern-day Albania). At the same time, Palinurus' rôle inevitably recalls other helmsmen in epic who die during a voyage. Closest to his situation is that of Phrontis, Menelaus' helmsman, who, like Palinurus, dies while on duty, gripping the steering oar in his hands (πηδάλιον μετὰ χερσὶ ... ἔχοντα: *Odyssey* 3.281). Tiphys, Jason's helmsman, also dies, but of an unspecified illness before the Argonauts reach their destination (*Argonautika* 2.854-7). He, too, was a highly skilled helmsman and, like Palinurus, had also on two occasions aroused the crew to take to the sea on his own initiative (*Argonautika* 1.522-3; 1.1274-5). By contrast, as will be demonstrated below, at the time when his body is found Misenus is relatively unknown and his Homeric association has not yet been disclosed.

5.3 The nature of Misenus' death

As is the case with Palinurus, the nature of Misenus' death has been open to variant interpretations, despite the entirely different circumstances and way in which they meet their respective ends. In the text, the initial explanation for the sudden and untimely death of Misenus is as a straightforward punishment for an act of hubris committed by challenging the gods to compete in a musical contest (6.172), just as the mythical Marsyas had done with equally disastrous outcome.²² On the other hand, Vergil immediately casts doubt over the story that Triton drowns Misenus by interjecting the words *si credere dignum est* (6.173), even though the reason for the death then remains unexplained. Indeed, Vergil may be considered already to have undermined the idea of divine anger by stating that Misenus was *indigna morte peremptum* (6.163), although no doubt he is also projecting his narratorial voice into the thoughts of the Trojans. With this apparently sceptical stance, therefore, Vergil may

²² Herodotus, VII.26.3; and, after Vergil's death, Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, VI.382-400.

seem to be inviting readers to take a demythologized interpretation of Misenus' death. If therefore we adopt such a reading for the death of Misenus, as previously for Palinurus' death, it is clear that Misenus' death by drowning is not punishment of hubris inflicted by an indignant god, but is the result either of an accident or of misadventure on the shore.²³ In the final analysis, all that Vergil communicates for certain is that Misenus dies after having been immersed in the sea, so the reader is left (as in the case of Palinurus) to decide whether or not divine intervention is responsible.

Here, again as with Palinurus, a number of scholars have employed the term 'sacrifice'. Brooks Otis interprets Misenus' death as 'a sacrifice ... to Hecate and the underworld deities'.²⁴ Similarly Deryck Williams speaks of this death as 'a sacrifice for the success of the mission'.²⁵ Cesáreo Bandera, however, proposes a wider perspective, linking Misenus with Palinurus, Orontes, and Creusa, and classifying the death as one of a number of examples of 'sacrifice in general' viewed as a 'law of history'.²⁶ For Owen Lee, however, Misenus' death is a sacrifice which fits into a pattern of seven deaths portrayed by Vergil as particularly affecting and linked thematically by a surrogate father-son relationship with Aeneas.²⁷ Putnam also moots the idea that the death may constitute some sort of sacrifice, noting that Misenus' pyre is called an *ara* (6.177: *aramque sepulcri*).²⁸ More recently, Julia Hejduk has also subscribed to the sacrifice theory.²⁹ As already argued elsewhere (Chapter 3) in relation to Palinurus, however, these interpretations stretch the meaning of 'sacrifice' too far.

Another variant interpretation is that Misenus is in a sense a proxy for Aeneas, a death required before his descent into the Underworld could be undertaken.³⁰ Previous mythical examples of mortals who return from Hades (such as Orpheus, Pollux, Theseus, and Hercules, all mentioned at 6.119-23, as well as Sisyphus, and Odysseus),

²³ *Contra* Horsfall (2013), Vol. 2, pp. 165, 175, note to 6.163.

²⁴ Otis (1964), pp. 281 n. 1, 288; also Hejduk (2001), p. 82 n. 18.

²⁵ Williams (1972), p. 470, note on 6.156; see also Paratore, III (1979), p. 234, note on 6.153.

²⁶ Williams (1972), p. 470, note on 6.156 ff; Bandera (1981), pp. 223, 226-8.

²⁷ Lee (1992), p. 87. The seven surrogate 'sons' are: Palinurus, Misenus, Nisus, Euryalus, Pallas, Lausus, Camilla [*sic*], the quasi-father-son relationship being based, in the case of the last two especially, on how their conduct and deaths affect *Pater* Aeneas.

²⁸ Putnam (1999), p. 213, where he places the word 'sacrifice' in inverted commas, but does not challenge it. The interpretation of *ara* at 6.177 has been controversial. Although noting that Probus and Donatus had reservations, Servius in his note *ad loc.* explains it simply as the pyre. Conington/Nettleship (1884), pp. 447-8, Norden (1927), p. 186, Fletcher (1941/66), pp. 43-4, Williams (1972), p. 470, Austin (1977), pp. 92-3, and Horsfall (2013), p. 182 concur. Bailey (1935), finds this interpretation 'far-fetched' (p. 290), seeing the *ara sepulcri* as an altar to the dead hero (297) and placing it in the context of Greek hero-cult (298).

²⁹ Hejduk (2001), pp. 81 n. 17, 82 n. 18.

³⁰ Segal (1965), p. 622: 'Misenus' life is in a sense the price of the Bough', citing Servius on 6.136: '*ramus enim necesse erat ut et unius causa esset interitus: unde et statim mortem subiungit Miseni.*'

however, suggest that no such substitution is necessary. Indeed, in the cases of both Hercules and Theseus, there is not even a previous death which could constitute a proxy, although Theseus' companion Pirithous is detained in Hades. In any event, the mere hint of hubris lying behind this unexpected death, even though perhaps unbeknown to the Trojans, intensifies the aura of miasma over and above the pollution associated with the death alone, and thus provides all the more reason for thoroughgoing purification.

A further link between the deaths of Misenus and Palinurus also needs to be considered, for which it is necessary to return to Neptune's prediction(s) in his conversation with Venus in Book 5 (see previous discussion in Chapter 3.4):

tutus, quos optas, portus accedet Averni.

unus erit tantum amissum quem gurgite quaeres;

unum pro multis dabitur caput. (5.813-5)

Neptune's utterance is cut off abruptly in a part-line consisting of only four complete feet.³¹ Such pithiness could well disguise the possibility that he may be speaking cryptically, perhaps duplicitously, of two deaths rather than one, for ambiguity in the oracular predictions of gods is scarcely uncommon. This idea has, however, been largely ignored or rejected by modern commentators, who tend to relate the prediction solely to Palinurus.³² Their view is perhaps understandable because Servius' text refers 5.814 to Misenus and 5.815 to Palinurus, whereas the reverse is more logical since Misenus' body is found by chance on the shore and is not looked for in the swell (as Palinurus may well have been).³³ Nothing in the text, however, requires the *unus* and the *unum* to refer to the same individual. Indeed, in his note to 5.815, Servius interprets these lines as referring to both individuals, stating bluntly that it would be wrong to interpret the lines as referring to a single death:

*falsum erit si unum voluerimus accipere: duos enim constat occisos,
Misenum et Palinurum.*

³¹ Sparrow (1931), p. 27, III.A.3. Two spondees followed by two dactyls. It is difficult, however, to agree with Sparrow's subsequent comment (pp. 39-40): 'The hemistich is not particularly effective'. On the contrary, although this part-line might have been completed had Vergil lived, as a *tibicen* it is by no means weak. As already pointed out in Chapter 3.4, line 5.815 also has a rare metrical pattern serving to stress its import.

³² Horsfall (2013), p. 168, §3, however, does note: 'clearly of Mis. as of Pal., it could be said *unum pro multis dabitur caput*'.

³³ Williams (1960), p. 193, note on 5.813 ff., omitted from Williams (1972), p. 451; Conington/Nettleship (1884), p. 415, note on 5.814, points out that Servius refers the lines 'curiously', but does not comment further.

Servius' *falsum erit* indicates that the appearance of the same word, differently inflected (*unus ... unum*), at the beginning of each of the lines is sufficient to mark difference,³⁴ although Williams has interpreted this repetition as giving special emphasis to one individual.³⁵ I shall return later to the interpretation of Neptune's words.

5.4 Who was Aeneas' companion Misenus?

Whether a man called Misenus appeared in literature as a follower of Aeneas before the time of Vergil is by no means certain. Outside of the *Aeneid*, extant mentions in antiquity of a Misenus are scarce and unfortunately limited to close contemporaries of Vergil. Indicators which hint at the possibility of one or more earlier traditions concerning a Misenus as a companion of Aeneas remain unsubstantiated. Moreover, the possibility must also exist, but cannot be proven, that the eponymous geographical feature may have given rise to the legend of a man rather than *vice versa*.³⁶ If that had been the case, it might go some way to explaining the uncertainty, which will be discussed below, as to whether the extant sources refer to two separate individuals with the same name, or whether some literary appropriation or confusion may have taken place at some unspecified time.

Strabo, some six or seven years younger than Vergil, mentions a Misenus, presumably Greek, as a companion of Odysseus.³⁷ Aeneas' arrival and subsequent activities in Italy coincide closely, of course, with Odysseus' presence in those regions, as confirmed in the *Aeneid* by the testimony of Achaemenides.³⁸ Nevertheless, although some 'cross-over' exists between the legends of the two heroes, and although some versions indicate that they could have met,³⁹ nothing else suggests that a Misenus was in one or other or both parties. In fact, the close chronology probably rules out identification of Vergil's Misenus with Strabo's. More conclusively, however, the possibility that a Misenus, like Achaemenides, somehow effected a transfer (unrecorded in the poem) from amongst Odysseus' followers to those of Aeneas must also be excluded, since the 'history' of Misenus as related in the *Aeneid* states that he joined

³⁴ Thereby disposing of any concern that to distinguish between two individuals *alter ... alterum* might have been linguistically more satisfactory.

³⁵ Williams (1960), p. 193, note on 5.815.

³⁶ Scafoglio (2005), p. 122.

³⁷ Strabo, Γεωγραφικά, 1.2.18; 5.4.6.

³⁸ According to Achaemenides, Aeneas arrives in Sicily only approximately three months after Odysseus (3.645-8).

³⁹ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Ῥωμαϊκή ἀρχαιολογία, 1.72.2, citing Hellanicus (*FGrHist* 4 F 84), and cf. Solmsen (1986); separately: [pseudo-]Aurelius Victor, *Origo gentis romanae*, 12.2.

Aeneas after having previously been a companion of Hector (6.166-70). On the other hand, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, perhaps ten years younger than Vergil, does mention a Misenus as one of the *Aeneadae*, but gives no detail except that Misenus was a distinguished person (τῶν ἐπιφανῶν τινοῦς) and that the harbour (not the promontory) where he died was named after him.⁴⁰ Although there appears to be no other mention of a Misenus in surviving sources, Dionysius, is unlikely to have included Misenus in his work simply as a result of a reference in the *Aeneid*, however famous the poem may already have become. Indeed, Dionysius' normal methodology, in accordance with his belief in truth and justice as the aims of history,⁴¹ involves scrutiny of earlier sources, and in fact his version of the journey up the coast of Campania differs from Vergil's in a number of detailed respects, supporting the likelihood that he had other sources.⁴² Norden believes that Dionysius' source was probably Varro.⁴³

Although no mention of a Misenus, Greek or Trojan, is to be found in either of the Homeric epics, it is possible that a Misenus may have featured as one of Aeneas' comrades in one or more lost poems, including those of the epic cycle. Such a link with Aeneas seems to be strongly indicated by the *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina*, in which a person clearly labelled 'ΜΙΣΗΝΟΣ' is shown boarding a ship immediately after Anchises, Aeneas and Ascanius.⁴⁴ In the lower right-hand corner of the central relief panel, Misenus is carrying a long object over his shoulder. Some scholars have suggested that the object could be an oar or a steering paddle,⁴⁵ but all of the oars, as well as the crew, are shown already in position on the ship and in any event the object is too short. On the basis of the shape, which is thin at the end held by Misenus' left hand and opens out at the end above his shoulder, there can be no doubt that it is a *tuba* (6.233), a straight horn similar to a modern post-horn. Misenus' rôle as trumpeter is, therefore, clearly illustrated here. Text carved into this *Tabula* listing literary sources of the scenes depicted suggests that the departure scene in which Misenus features derives from a sixth-century lyric poem concerning the sack of Troy by Stesichorus (Ἰλίου πέρσις κατὰ Στησίχορον), rather than the better-known epic attributed to Arctinus, who in any event is cited separately on the *Tabula* as author of the *Aethiopis*. Controversy exists over the credibility of the attribution to Stesichorus in the *Tabula* (see below), but

⁴⁰ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ῥωμαϊκὴ ἀρχαιολογία*, 1.53.3.

⁴¹ *Idem, ibidem*, 1.6.5.

⁴² *Idem, ibidem*, 1.53.2-3, gives Leucosia (Licosa) and Prochyta (Procida) as additional stopping places en route named after women who died there.

⁴³ Norden (1927), p. 179.

⁴⁴ Musei Capitolini, Roma: Sala delle Colombe (Inv. Scu 316), <http://capitolini.info/scu00316/?lang=it>.

⁴⁵ Schreiber (1895), p. 178; Sadurska (1964), p. 29.

any doubt which may exist over attribution does not detract from the linkage of Misenus with Aeneas. More vexed is the question as to whether the artist or sculptor may have been influenced by knowledge of the work of Vergil. Dating is important here, but has been surrounded by uncertainty and disagreement. In her major contribution concerning the group of (then 19) artefacts known collectively as *Tabulae Iliacae*, featuring scenes from the *Iliad* and other sources, Anna Sadurska took the view that the *Tabula Capitolina* was the first of the genre, and dated it, on the grounds of iconography, composition, style, and especially the richness of details, to the last quarter of the first century BCE ‘*selon toute probabilité*’.⁴⁶ Previously, some scholars had favoured dates in the first century CE.⁴⁷ Early this century Nina Valenzuela Montenegro favoured a date close to the end of the range proposed by Sadurska, accepting the dedication of the Forum of Augustus around 5 BCE as a *terminus post quem* for the *Tabula Capitolina*.⁴⁸ In his most recent study, David Petrain concurs that the *Tabula Capitolina* is amongst the earliest of the 23 currently known *Tabulae*, and has also accepted 5 BCE as an approximate date after which the artefacts were produced.⁴⁹ Both he and Michael Squire recognize that the iconography of the Aeneas-Anchises-Ascanius group departing from Troy is similar to that of a sculpture erected in the Augustan Forum. Squire has, however, pointed out that construction work on the Forum began in 17 BCE, and observes that as a *terminus post quem* the completion date is ‘rather more approximate than many scholars have cared to admit’.⁵⁰ Presumably, the concept and plans for the Aeneas-Anchises-Ascanius sculpture must have existed some years beforehand. In expressing this *caveat*, Squire draws attention to ‘a much longer iconographic tradition’ exemplified by wall paintings in Pompeii dating from around 30 BCE.⁵¹ He concludes that he does not think Sadurska was necessarily wrong ‘to posit a slightly earlier date, in the last quarter of the first century BC, at least for some of the tablets’.⁵²

⁴⁶ Sadurska (1964), p. 37.

⁴⁷ For example, Hubaux (1933), p. 162, had suggested that the *Tabula Capitolina* is Neronian.

⁴⁸ Valenzuela Montenegro (2004), p. 309.

⁴⁹ Petrain (2014), p. 20; Horsfall (1979), p. 32, postulates as ‘a firm *terminus post quem*’ the date of the publication of the *Aeneid* after Vergil’s death.

⁵⁰ Squire (2011), p. 59 and n. 82.

⁵¹ The frieze in the House of the Cryptoportico, Pompeii (I.6.2): Squire (2011), p. 59 n. 82; also mentioned by: Valenzuela Montenegro (2004), p. 306; Petrain (2014), p. 108.

⁵² Squire (2011), p. 58 n. 78. Sadurska (1964), p. 83, had already pointed out that Tabula 18L dates from around 16-20 CE, and (p. 93) that 19J dates to the reign of Commodus. Squire (2011), p. 58 and Petrain (2014), p. 20, concur, noting also that 22Get (or 22VP), unknown to Sadurska, also dates from shortly after 15/16 CE.

Ultimately, the dating cannot be resolved conclusively, but if the earlier dating for the *Tabula Capitolina* is correct, the likelihood of Vergilian influence is reduced, for although according to Aelius Donatus three books of the *Aeneid* were recited to the imperial family shortly after the death of Marcellus in 23 BCE, the text was not published in full by Vergil's literary executors until around 17 BCE, two years after the poet's death.⁵³ Della Corte is categorical that the reliefs were not influenced by the *Aeneid*, but does not give detailed reasons.⁵⁴ On the other hand, Karl Galinsky suggests that the popularity of the *Aeneid* accounts for the inclusion of Misenus in the *Tabula Capitolina*.⁵⁵ Similarly, Horsfall is vigorous in his rejection of the attribution to Stesichorus in the *Tabula Capitolina* and argues strongly in favour of a Vergilian influence on the sculptor, whilst conceding that there is no certainty.⁵⁶ In a more recent contribution to the debate, however, Scafoglio has convincingly rejected each one of four specific arguments, although he too acknowledges that there is no absolutely conclusive evidence.⁵⁷ Petrain considers Scafoglio's arguments to have been 'vitiating' by the untenable idea that the *Tabulae* are copies of a lost Greek artwork'.⁵⁸ Nevertheless, the arguments still hold if the tablets are considered not as having been copied from Greek originals but as having been influenced by the much longer iconographic tradition noted by Squire and already cited above.⁵⁹ Moreover, in the 'set' of images purporting to derive from Stesichorus and illustrating Aeneas' escape from Troy, there is one incontrovertibly non-Vergilian element, namely the appearance of Hermes guiding the family out of the city.⁶⁰ Both Valenzuela Montenegro and Squire (albeit a little less categorically) also consider Vergilian influence unlikely.⁶¹ Petrain scarcely mentions Vergil directly, but does tend to the view that the tablet 'has *some* legitimate connection to Stesichorus'.⁶²

⁵³ Brugnoli & Stok (1997), p. 32 (Donatus §32), pp. 97-8 (Donatus auctus §46).

⁵⁴ della Corte (1972), p. 41: 'Sta di fatto che le *Tabulae* non sono state influenzate dall' «Eneide»; se mai furono esse a influenzare il poeta'. On the matter of date, however, he is unclear, describing the *Tabula* both as Augustan (p. 41) and Neronian (p. 44).

⁵⁵ Galinsky (1969), p. 109.

⁵⁶ Horsfall (1979), pp. 38, 41; reiterated in Horsfall (2008), Appendix 2, pp. 587-91, and Horsfall (2013), Vol. 2, p. 165.

⁵⁷ Scafoglio (2005), pp. 119-23.

⁵⁸ Petrain (2014), p. 98, n. 89. From the context, it appears to me that Petrain uses 'vitiating' as meaning 'impaired' rather than 'invalidated'.

⁵⁹ Squire (2011), p. 59 note 82.

⁶⁰ Galinsky (1969), p. 106; Horsfall (1979), p. 40-2; Petrain (2014), p. 129: 'In ancient art, the only other example of Hermes in this rôle is from the painted frieze in Pompeii's House of the Cryptoportico'.

⁶¹ Valenzuela Montenegro (2004), p. 391; Squire (2011), p. 155.

⁶² Petrain (2014), p. 102 [his italics]. Nevertheless, within much the same publication time-frame Horsfall (2013), Vol. 2, p. 165, reiterates the 'unlikely indebtedness to Stesichorus'.

Returning to the *Aeneid*, the Trojan Misenus whose dead body is discovered has not featured amongst the numerous comrades of Aeneas named at Carthage in Book 1 or in the commemorative games at Drepanum in Book 5. Before his death is reported, he is only named once previously in the *Aeneid*, when he sounds the alarm to warn the Trojans of the approach of the Harpies (3.239). Indeed, there are occasions when Vergil could have introduced a mention of Misenus, but does not, namely when a trumpet is sounded firstly for the beginning of the games (5.113) and then for the start of the ship race (5.139). Similarly, when Palinurus gives a signal from the stern of his ship (*dat clarum ... signum*: 3.519), a trumpet-call might have been more appropriate to rouse the crews in the middle of the night (3.512). It is also curious that Misenus is designated as a former comrade of Hector who went into battle with trumpet and spear (*lituo pugnans insignis obibat et hasta*, 6.167), since not only is Misenus not mentioned in either of the Homeric epics, but also the trumpet was unknown to the warriors in those poems.⁶³ Hence, apart from the association with Elpenor, which is scarcely apparent to first-time readers until his oar is placed upon his grave along with his trumpet (6.233), Misenus is not strongly linked either externally to incidents in earlier extant epic or internally to other episodes within the *Aeneid*. Absence of strong internal and external associations has the effect of diverting readers' minds away from sympathy for the individual in order to focus their thoughts on the circumstances and events which attend this death, including the discovery of the Golden Bough and the meticulously prepared and executed funeral rites. This contrasts strongly with the sympathetic treatment of Palinurus' death which concludes with the epigrammatic epitaph accorded to him by Aeneas (5.870-1) and emphasized by the first line of Book 6. Subsequently, of course, Vergil provides Misenus with an honourable past in another epigrammatic epitaph (6.164-7),⁶⁴ but an appropriate background had to be provided beforehand in order to justify the elaborate funeral accorded to Misenus later. Nevertheless, Misenus remains something of a cipher, and the focus is more on the ceremonial than on the individual.

In keeping with the air of a certain mystery surrounding this character, Vergil is also ambiguous about Misenus' genealogy. Although when Misenus' body is found, he is described as *Misenum Aeoliden* (6.164), the patronymic is multivalent.⁶⁵ Misenus could have been a son of the wind god Aeolus (aptly so, since he blows a wind

⁶³ Heinze (1915), p. 196, states that the trumpet was believed by Vergil and his contemporaries to have been an invention of the Etruscans; Edwards (1991), p. 172, note to 18.219-21: 'Homer knows the trumpet but his heroes do not'.

⁶⁴ Dinter (2005), p. 158-9 discusses the epigram for Misenus along with those for Palinurus and Caieta.

⁶⁵ The genealogy of the Aeolides is notoriously complex. Diodorus Siculus 4.67 provides an overview.

instrument), or of the Trojan Aeolus, whose epitaph is given in an apostrophe by Vergil as narrator at 12.542-7.⁶⁶ A further possibility, although not pursued at all vigorously, if at all, in commentaries, also links him back to Odysseus, who at 6.529 is referred to by Deiphobus as *Aeolides*, hearking back to the alternative and uncomplimentary non-Homeric version of Odysseus' birth, not as the son of Laertes, but son of Sisyphus and therefore grandson of Aeolus, son of Hellen and mythical King of Aeolia/Thessaly.⁶⁷ Under this scenario, Misenus could have been related to Odysseus, possibly as some degree of nephew or cousin. A similar relationship, but with an Aeolus of a later generation of the same family, who is the (human) keeper of the winds in the *Odyssey*, is postulated by Hugh Lloyd-Jones. He has argued, on the basis of a Stesichorus fragment, that Odysseus and this later Aeolus, presumed to be the father of Misenus, were first cousins.⁶⁸ This identification has been questioned by Michael Haslam, and then reasserted by Lloyd-Jones.⁶⁹ The unidentified corpse buried by Odysseus in the Stesichorus fragment may not, however, even have been a Misenus. Moreover, if a Misenus, it need not have been the same Misenus as is buried by Aeneas, unless at some point, as seems quite possible, a confusion arose which transferred a Greek Misenus from amongst the followers of Odysseus to the Trojan followers of Aeneas.

Unfortunately, no conclusive evidence enables us to confirm or deny the existence of an independent and older literary tradition in which a Trojan Misenus featured previously in the legends concerning the wanderings of Aeneas. On balance, however, arguments in favour of Vergil having drawn on some earlier tradition seem to me more convincing.⁷⁰ Whether two Misen(o)i existed in legend, however, or whether a single character was deemed sometimes Greek sometimes Trojan is impossible to say.

5.5 Misenus as bard: metapoetic significance

Elements of metapoetic significance can also be discerned underlying the character of Misenus. Moreover, given that he is endowed with only weak internal and external associations, such elements gain greater prominence. In the descriptions of Misenus' skill with his instrument, the call of his trumpet (*lituo*, 6.167; *tubam*, 6.233) is

⁶⁶ Notes to 6.164 in: Fletcher (1941/66), p. 43; Williams (1972), p. 470.

⁶⁷ As, for example, in: Sophocles, *Ajax* 190, *Philoctetes* 417; Euripides, *Cyclops* 104.

⁶⁸ Lloyd-Jones (1991a), p. 299; this would make Misenus and Odysseus first cousins once removed.

⁶⁹ Haslam (1991); Lloyd-Jones (1991b).

⁷⁰ Interestingly, Horsfall (2013), Vol. 1, p. xviii, recognizes Misenus as 'solidly enough located in the antiquarian tradition about the companions of Aen.', citing Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Strabo, but without commenting on the Greek-Trojan issue.

described twice with the word *cantu* (6.165, 172).⁷¹ Not only is this word from the same etymological root as the verb used to introduce the epic ‘song’ at *Aeneid* 1.1 (*cano*), but it is also used elsewhere by Vergil to refer to his epic, specifically in his invocations to the Muses in Books 7 and 10, which both open with identical wording:

Pandite nunc Helicon, deae, cantusque movete (7.641, 10.163)

Cognate words are also used to refer to other poetic song, as with the Sibyl’s mention of Orpheus (6.120: *canoris*).⁷² More particularly, at 9.525, in another invocation to Calliope and her sister Muses, Vergil uses the first person (*precor, adspirate canenti*) portraying himself as a poet seeking inspiration. He goes even further when referring to another (mythical) epic bard, Cretheus. Not only does he use the verb (*canebat*) at 9.777, but he also associates himself personally with Cretheus, since the latter is said to have sung of the arms of men:

[Turnus slays] *et Clytium Aeoliden et amicū Crethea Musis,*

Crethea Musarum comitem, cui carmina semper

et citharae cordi numerosque intendere neruis,

semper equos atque arma uirum pugnasque canebat. (9.774-7)

Although *virum* is genitive plural here, rather than accusative singular, a reference back to the *arma virumque* in the first line of the *Aeneid* is unmistakable. Cretheus’ skill is emphasized by the immediate echo of the end of line 774 at the beginning of 775 and by the alliteration of the letter ‘c’, which, as a plosive consonant, mimics the plucking of the strings of the cithara. In his commentary on Book 9, Hardie notes the self-reflective reference by Vergil at 9.774-7, in which the poet both includes an honourable allusion to other poets and associates himself with them, especially Horace, who refers to himself as *Musis amicus* (*Carmina* 1.26.1), and the bard Demodocus-Homer, whom the Muses loved (*Odyssey* 8.63).⁷³ Fowler also links Cretheus with Vergil, as well as to Iopas (*canit*: 1.742) and even to Aeneas (*canebat*: 4.14), but does not connect him with Misenus.⁷⁴ The Cretheus-Vergil identification, however, is worth pursuing further, for the slaughter of a bard is somewhat alarming. Cretheus is amongst the many Trojan

⁷¹ Austin (1977), p. 91, note to 6.167, points out that strictly speaking *lituo* and *tuba* are not synonymous, the former having a curve, but there is no reason to believe that Vergil is referring to two separate instruments, nor that they are different from the *aere cavo* of 3.240.

⁷² Dinter (2005), p. 165, notes that the words *carmen* [from *can-men*], *cantare* or *cantus* are linked to minor heroes seven times, but he does not pursue this linkage in relation to Misenus.

⁷³ Hardie (1994), pp. 238-9, notes to 9.774-8 and 9.774, where a possible allusion to Cretheis, mother of Homer, is also noted; cf. also Dingel (1997), p. 269, note to 9.774.

⁷⁴ Fowler (1997c), pp. 267-8.

warriors slaughtered by Turnus in a mindless frenzy. Perhaps Vergil, whose heart also delighted in poetic composition, felt particular sympathy for Cretheus, intimating here his worst nightmare: being reduced to nothing by the unbridled *furor* of un-Roman *obtrectatores*.⁷⁵

A further association should also be noted here, for a man called Cretheus is attested as a son of Aeolus, the mythical king of Thessaly.⁷⁶ The chronology of generations, however, is such that Vergil is most unlikely to have conceived of the Cretheus in the *Aeneid* as the son of Aeolus (and brother of Sisyphus) who became the grandfather of the argonaut Jason.⁷⁷ Cretheus the bard could, however, possibly have been a later unattested descendant. Nevertheless, an Aeolid connexion is brought to mind, assisted by the fact that Clytius who is killed immediately before Cretheus at 9.774 is explicitly referred to as Aeolides, even though not attested elsewhere as an Aeolid.⁷⁸ This fact has caused at least one scholar to suggest that line 774 may be anastrophe,⁷⁹ and hence that the adjective *Aeoliden*, which precedes *et*, would refer to Cretheus rather than Clytius, but others dissent.⁸⁰ An additional difficulty is that Cretheus and Clytius (if an Aeolid) would have been Greeks translated somehow into the Trojan army, as may have happened with Misenus at some point.⁸¹ In any event, an interesting nexus of mythical and literary associations is created here, with Cretheus linked not only to Clytius, but also to Misenus Aeolides and to Vergil himself.

Against this complex metapoetic and allusive background, Misenus is alleged, overconfidently because of the success he has experienced in his art (*praestantior*, 6.164), to have had the temerity to challenge the gods to a musical contest. He is thereby immediately linked with other hubristic performers, such as Marsyas and Thamyras, who challenged a god or the Muses to compete against them, and who inevitably suffered tragic consequences.⁸² Perhaps even more pertinently, as a

⁷⁵ Woldemar Görler in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, III (1987), pp. 807-9, s.v. 'Obtrectatores', points out that Vergil had detractors from as early as publication of the *Eclogues*; Clausen (1994), pp. 112-3, note on *Eclogue* 3.90, refers to two, namely Bavius and Mevius.

⁷⁶ Hesiod, *Γυναικῶν κατάλογος*, fragment 10 [continued], ll. 25-34, in Most (2007); *Odyssey* 11.237; *Argonautika* 2.1162-4, 3.360-1; cf. also Heubeck & Hoekstra (1989), p. 92, introductory note to ll. 235-59; Lachenaud (2010), p.34.

⁷⁷ Hesiod, *op. cit.*, fragment 37.

⁷⁸ According to their respective notes to 9.774, Hardie (1994), p. 238, and Dingel (1997), p. 269, Clytius is a common name of heroes. Worth noting, however, is that a Clytius son of Eurytus is mentioned at *Argonautika* 1.86-7 and 2.1043 as an argonaut.

⁷⁹ Francesco della Corte in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, I (1984), p. 930, s.v. 'Creteo'.

⁸⁰ Notes to 9.774 in Hardie (1994), p. 238, and Dingel (1997), p. 269.

⁸¹ Or, alternatively, they could have been Arcadians sent by Evander.

⁸² (a) Marsyas: Herodotus, 7.26.3; and, after Vergil's death, Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 6.382-400; cf. also *Metamorphoses* 6.1-145 concerning Arachne; (b) Thamyras: *Iliad* 2.594-600.

performer Misenus is also linked to Orpheus who, in one version of legend, was dismembered by Thracian maenads because his exclusive dedication to the sun-god Apollo aroused the jealousy of Dionysus/Bacchus, who considered that he was not being given due honour by Orpheus.⁸³

At the same time, the sea, too, has been endowed with metapoetic significance by Hellenistic writers and commentators since Callimachus (and perhaps before). In the concluding lines of Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*, Envy (Φθόνος) states that he does not admire the bard who does not sing as much as the sea:

οὐκ ἄγαμαι τὸν ἀοιδὸν ὃς οὐδ' ὅσα πόντος ἀείδει. (106)

In a lengthy note and an appendix in his commentary on this particular hymn, Frederick Williams argues strongly for the identification of the sea with Homer.⁸⁴ Despite subsequent dissent by Alan Cameron concerning this particular poem, on the grounds that nothing said by Envy should be relied upon,⁸⁵ Harrison supports the view put forward by Williams, indicating that Homer as the sea or Ocean is 'an established image by the Hellenistic period'.⁸⁶ Importantly for the present purpose, both Williams and Harrison cite *inter alios* Dionysius of Halicarnassus.⁸⁷ Like his close contemporary, Vergil must also have been well aware of this literary image, as is evident from a similar metapoetic passage spoken by Cyrene in the fourth book of the *Georgics*:

'Oceano libemus' ait. Simul ipsa precatur

Oceanumque patrem rerum Nymphasque sorores (*Georgics* 4.381-2)

With its sheer volume, the great ocean of past literature, notably the Homeric epics, appears to overwhelm the audacious poet represented by Misenus-Vergil. This is not an isolated example. Elsewhere, too, Vergil has woven metaliterary *aemulatio* into his poem. In his earlier description of the ship race, Vergil seems almost triumphant when he asserts that two-horse chariots (such as competed at Patroclus' funeral games) are not so fast as the Trojans' ships (*non tam praecipites*; 5.144).⁸⁸ It is difficult not to interpret this simile as claiming superiority over his eminent predecessor.⁸⁹ On the other hand, such excess of confidence is perhaps not typical, for shortly afterwards, a

⁸³ Wili (1944/55), p. 69; Aeschylus, *Βασσάραι/Βασσαρίδες*, *TrGF*, 3 (1985), pp. 138-40; also Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 11.1-55.

⁸⁴ Williams, F (1978), pp. 85-9 (introductory notes to ll. 105-13), and pp. 98-9 (Appendix).

⁸⁵ Cameron (1995), pp. 403-7.

⁸⁶ Harrison (2007), section 2.

⁸⁷ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Περὶ συθέσεως ὀνομάτων*, 24; cf. also Gowers (2012), pp. 149, 157, concerning 'muddy stream' allusion to Callimachus at Horace, *Satires*, 1.4.11.

⁸⁸ Feldherr (1995), p. 245.

⁸⁹ Farrell (1997), p. 232; see also discussion in Chapter 6.3, below.

foreboding incident occurs, when the older contender in the boxing match, Entellus, beats the boastful younger one, Dares (5.453-60). Vergil may here be expressing a degree of insecurity *vis à vis* the earlier poet.⁹⁰ Previously in Book 6, also, shortly before the Misenus episode, there is a strong metapoetic nuance to Daedalus' inability to describe the fall of Icarus (6.32-3.). That Misenus is depicted as a talented performer and associated by allusion with Marsyas and Thamyras also suggests strongly that Vergil is again making a metapoetic point. As with the boxing match, however, Vergil is not so sanguine in the Misenus episode. In danger of being swamped by the vastly superior force of Ocean-Homer, the poet pays tribute to his ancient predecessor.

5.6 Misenus' funeral

Lamentation and the preparations for Misenus' funeral commence immediately after his body has been found on the shore (6.175-84), and provide a neat lead into the intercalated episode of the Golden Bough (6.185-211), which will be discussed separately (Chapter 6.4). In fact, Aeneas' sense of loss is given particular weight through the inclusion of an apostrophe to Misenus (6.189) at the beginning of the Golden Bough episode, immediately before the appearance of the pair of doves (6.190). Following the collection of the Golden Bough, the narrative then returns to the practicalities of the funeral (6.212-235).

In order to help highlight the particular function and importance of Misenus' funeral within the poem as a whole, it is worth first taking a look at four other funerals in the *Aeneid* which offer some points of interest, specifically those of Polydorus, Anchises, Pallas and the mass cremation of the fallen warriors during the truce in Book 11. Polydorus' (re)burial is described very briefly at 3.62-8. Coming fairly soon after the departure of the fugitives from Antandros, this is to be understood as the last Trojan funeral to take place in the *Aeneid*, the most notable Trojan feature being the presence of the women with their hair loosened. Before the games commence in Book 5, a few very brief mentions are made, but without detail, of the fact that Anchises was given a funeral the previous year and that his cremated bones were buried at Drepanum (5.31, 47-8, 55, 76, 80). Book 11 has two funerals. Firstly, Vergil describes the magnificent bier and cortège which are to take the corpse of Pallas back to Pallanteum (11.59-93). It is a deeply moving passage, conveying the depth of grief and guilt experienced by Aeneas, who is very much to the fore during this scene. Descriptive

⁹⁰ Farrell (1997), p. 233.

detail is limited, however, to the bier and the procession, which includes the eight young Italian warriors doomed to be slaughtered later. The funeral itself, of course, and the ritual slaughter take place ‘off-stage’. Soon afterwards in the same book, a description is given of the mass funerals for those who died in battle on both sides (11.119, 133-8, 184-212), mostly cremations, but also inhumations in the case of some of the Latins (11.205). Although the rituals are not described with the same degree of detail as for Misenus’ funeral, the huge scale befits the number of the dead. Moreover, the rituals are ‘almost, if not quite, wholly Roman’,⁹¹ even though they are said to reflect the customs of the two opposing sides (*suorum | more ... patrum*, 11.185-6). Both an armoured parade around the pyre and the sacrifice of numerous animals are included, the latter having all the elements of a *suovetaurilia*.⁹² Worth noting also is that the preparations for these funerals have much in common with the preparations for Misenus’ funeral, and will be discussed further within that context, below.

Turning, now, to Misenus’ funeral, two aspects of the funeral need to be given particular attention, namely (i) the closeness with which the description corresponds to funerary ritual of the first century BCE, and (ii) the relationship of Misenus’ funeral to those of Patroclus in *Iliad* 23 and of Idmon in *Argonautika* 2, as well as to Ennius’ *Annales*.

Unlike Vergil’s descriptions of sacrifices discussed elsewhere, which are eclectic and often, by omitting whole processes, rely on the personal experience of the reader to flesh out details,⁹³ the account of Misenus’ funeral is, although concise, complete in its essentials, conforming broadly to the pattern of Roman funerals in the age of Augustus as described by Hope.⁹⁴ While Aeneas is absent following the doves as they lead him towards the Golden Bough, the Trojans build a huge pyre with the timber they have collected, interweaving dark foliage along the sides and setting up cypresses in front. They wash and anoint the body, then lamenting, they place it on a couch and cover it with purple robes. After placing the bier on the pyre, those who apply the fire do so with faces turned away. Funerary gifts, including perhaps a significant quantity of comestibles, are burned with the corpse.⁹⁵ When the fire has subsided, the ashes are quenched with wine, the bones are collected in a bronze urn, those present are purified,

⁹¹ Bailey (1935), p. 286.

⁹² Bailey (1935), p. 287.

⁹³ Shatzman (1974), pp. 51-2.

⁹⁴ Hope (2009), pp. 65-96, citing numerous ancient literary sources in the notes (pp. 202-6), without undue reliance on Vergil, but pointing out also (p. 66) that ‘literary evidence is biased towards the élite’.

⁹⁵ Yona (2012) argues that the word *dapes* (6.225) represents ‘a great quantity of food’ (p. 57), *contra* Bailey (1935), p. 289, where *dapes* are interpreted as simple offerings such as cakes and honey.

and the *novissima verba* spoken. Finally, a burial mound is raised, upon which Misenus' oar, trumpet and other equipment are placed.

In this account, the main omission is only a funeral procession, which, as already mentioned, is described separately when Pallas' body is sent back to his father. The further omission of a parade of family masks or images and of a funeral oration would scarcely have been appropriate in the circumstances of Book 6. On the basis of the above, and in view of the proleptic *more parentum* at 6.223, several scholars have effectively caused Misenus' funeral to be viewed as the classic example of Roman funerary ritual.⁹⁶ In particular, although Misenus' funeral is a 'blend of Greek and Roman usage (which indeed are sometimes identical)',⁹⁷ no elements are uniquely Greek, while some are uniquely Roman, such as the averting of the face when lighting the pyre (6.224), the *novissima verba* (6.231), and, of special significance here, the purification of the mourners (6.231). This purification finally removes the aura of pollution which was pointed out by the Sibyl and which was emanating from Misenus' unburied corpse, as well as from his supposed hubris and from the Carthaginian episode. More recently, however, Horsfall has taken issue with 'the conventional view of these verses [6.212-35] as a faithful portrait of a traditional Rom. Funeral'.⁹⁸ In so far as the account of Misenus' funeral is condensed and written in an elevated poetic style which, according to Horsfall, is 'euphuistic' and unsuited to accurate detail, his point carries some validity.⁹⁹ On the other hand, applying the standards of *verismo* to ancient epic is too rigorous. Given that the essential components of Roman funerary practice are present, taken as a whole this admittedly short account offers an atmospheric and near-complete picture, even though it neither constitutes a 'how to' manual nor an immutable ritual template.

Commentators point to the funeral of Patroclus in Book 23 of the Iliad as the model which Vergil adopted for the funeral of Misenus.¹⁰⁰ Indeed an intertextual reference to the dead Patroclus earlier in the book (6.149) has already been noted (see 5.1, above). There are, of course, numerous similarities. Both accounts start with the cutting and collection of the wood for the pyre, which includes oak (*robur* 6.181, *robore*

⁹⁶ Norden (1927), p. 194; Bailey (1935) pp. 289; Fletcher (1941/66), pp. 47-8, note to 6.234; Toynbee (1971), Chapter II, especially pp. 39-42, and Chapter III, especially pp. 43-55; Austin (1977), p. 102: 'The passage is a *locus classicus* for the most elaborate kind of Roman funeral ceremony'.

⁹⁷ Horsfall (2013), Vol. 1, p. xviii.

⁹⁸ Horsfall (2013), Vol. 2, p. 172, note to 6.156-82, 212-35.

⁹⁹ Horsfall (2013), Vol. 2, p. 203, note to 6.212-35.

¹⁰⁰ Norden (1927), p. 186, note to 6.177 ff., 194, note to 6.212 ff.; Fletcher (1941/66), pp. 47-8, note to 6.234; Williams (1972), p.472, note to 6.212 ff.; Austin (1977), p. 102, introductory note to 6.212-35.

6.214; δρῶς 23.118), which is cut down with axes (*securibus* 6.180; πελέκεας 23.114) and split with wedges (*cuneis* ... *scinditur* 6.181-2; διαπλήσσοντες 23.120) amidst considerable noise (*sonat* 6.180; κτυπέουσai 23.119). For both corpses, a huge pyre is built (*ingentem* ... *pyram* 6.215; πυρὴν ἐκατόμπεδον 23.164), provided with gifts including oil (*olivo* 6.225; ἀλείφατος 23.170), and subsequently, after the pyres have been dowsed with wine (*vino* 6.227; οἶνω 23.237), their ashes are placed in an urn, bronze for Misenus, gold for Patroclus (*cado* ... *aeno* 6.228; χρυσέῃ φιάλῃ 23.243). Finally, a barrow is heaped up over each of the graves (*ingenti mole sepulcrum* 6.232; τύμβον 23.245, σῆμα 23.255).

Whilst the similarities with *Iliad* 23 are clear, the differences, in addition to the Roman character of the ritual, are even more apparent. As has been mentioned, Vergil's account of Misenus' funeral is concise. Including both the preparation and the ceremony (6.175-184 and 6.212-35), the account runs to only 34 lines. Patroclus' funeral, on the other hand, occupies 150 lines (*Iliad* 23.108-257). Part of the difference is structural. In the *Iliad*, the funeral is punctuated by activities which do not take place in the *Aeneid*, such as the procession of the Myrmidons who cover the corpse with their shorn hair (23.128-37), and the address to the river Spercheus by Achilles which accompanies the cutting of a lock of his own hair (23.140-62). Similarly, the action is interrupted by the episode in which, following a prayer from Achilles, Iris visits Boreas and Zephyr in order to ask them to help the pyre burn (23.194-213). A more important structural difference arises from the location of Patroclus' funeral within the text of the *Iliad*. The funeral takes place in the penultimate book of the poem, and is a necessary part of the chain of causality driving the final actions of the poem. Patroclus' demand for burial has to be satisfied, but his death is the immediate cause of the redirection of Achilles' anger and his return to the battlefield to wreak revenge. Hence, with Achilles' anger refocusing upon Hector, the funeral provides the occasion for Achilles to address respectful words to Agamemnon and to act accordingly by acknowledging his prowess as a spear-thrower at the end of the book (23.890-3), thereby effectively ending their quarrel. Reconciliation with Agamemnon and anger against Hector thus become important sentiments underlying the death ritual for Patroclus.¹⁰¹ At the same time, although the magnificence of Patroclus' funeral is ostensibly justified by the fact that he has been a significant character in the poem, not only as a friend and prominent follower of Achilles but also as a heroic fighter in his own right, the whole event also accrues to

¹⁰¹ Seaford (1994), p. 164.

the glory of Achilles as a preliminary to the culmination of his achievements as a warrior in the defeat of Hector. Whilst lamentation for Patroclus is stressed throughout, therefore, Achilles' reputation and his personal concerns, emotions, and intentions are more prominent, as reflected by his prayers to the gods of the winds. No-one but Achilles would have been able to summon divine help as he does.¹⁰²

One other interesting point here is that the collection of Misenus' bones and the ritual purification are carried out by Corynaeus, another unknown character, who also speaks the *novissima verba* (6.228-31).¹⁰³ Corynaeus has not been mentioned previously in the poem. Later, however, a Corynaeus is killed by Asilas (9.571), whilst another Corynaeus is a combatant at 12.298.¹⁰⁴ It is no doubt appropriate that the purification of Aeneas should not be carried out by Aeneas himself, but it is intriguing that Vergil has chosen an unknown person to do so. In the *Iliad*, in addition to Achilles, Agamemnon and Meriones, the divine characters, Iris and the two wind-gods, also play a rôle in the funeral proceedings, thereby underlining the influence and importance of Achilles. Conversely, in the *Aeneid*, the absence of prominent characters (other than Aeneas, who has to be present) ensures that readers' attention is not deflected from the funeral ceremony itself.

A further major difference between the two epics is the horrendous brutality perpetrated by Achilles in the *Iliad* to mark his grief. Killing four horses and two dogs (23.171-4), quite apart from the flaying of many sheep and cattle (23.166-7), may seem excessive to the modern reader, but worse follows in the slaughter of twelve Trojan captives. The poet himself draws attention to this action:

... κακὰ δὲ φρεσὶ μῆδετο ἔργα (23.176)

Richardson aptly describes this as 'exceptional savagery', although opines that the narratorial comment need not necessarily be interpreted as moral condemnation.¹⁰⁵ It is interesting to note that although Vergil evidently decided to follow his Homeric model to the extent that Aeneas captures eight Italian warriors for the same purpose, he does not associate their ritual killing with Misenus' cremation. These brutal and un-Roman

¹⁰² Richardson (1993), p. 65, introductory note to Book 23, commenting on the excess of the funeral, observes aptly: 'Akhilleus is the only mortal who could evoke such a divine response'.

¹⁰³ Neither function carried out by Aeneas, as stated by Bailey (1935), p. 288.

¹⁰⁴ Williams (1973), p. 457, note to 12.298-9, identifies the Corynaeus of 6.228 with the one killed at 9.571, the one at 12.298 being different, but there is no obvious evidence to support this view, and there could even have been three of the same name, none of whom was of particular prominence.

¹⁰⁵ Richardson (1993), p. 189, note to 23.176; Seaford (1994), p. 165, takes the opposite view, perceiving 'an element of narrative ethical disapproval'.

executions take place much later, in the context of Pallas' funeral, which is not described.

Unlike Patroclus' funeral, Misenus' funeral is located in the middle of the *Aeneid*, immediately before the descent to the Underworld. Obviously, part of the significance of this placement lies in the purification carried out in the context of the funeral (6.230: *lustravitque viros*), a lustration, that is, not only of Aeneas, but of all of the *viros*, thereby removing the pollution of 'the whole fleet' indicated by the Sibyl, and fulfilling one of her preconditions for Aeneas' entry to the Underworld. Further possible significance of Misenus' funeral will be suggested in section 5.7, below.

Although the primary model for Misenus' funeral is from the *Iliad*, the episode also recalls other epic funerals. One such is the funeral of Idmon (*Argonautika* 2.835-50). Although only accorded a short passage, Idmon's funeral is described by Apollonius Rhodius as befitting a great man (μεγαλωστί: 838). Other salient features corresponding to Misenus' funeral are the barrow and its marker (842) and the headland (844) on which they are positioned. Most remarkable in the present context, however, is the fact that Idmon is another Aeolid (849-50).¹⁰⁶ Hence if, owing to the small amount of detail about this funeral given in the *Argonautika*, any doubt were entertained concerning an allusion to Idmon in Misenus' funeral, this further Aeolid reference removes any such doubt. Moreover, it cannot be coincidental that the death and funeral of Idmon immediately precede the death and funeral of Tiphys (851-63.), which is also evoked in relation to Palinurus (as discussed in Chapter 3.3, above).

The third literary description evoked by the preparations for the funeral of Misenus is to be found in a fragment of the *Annales* of Quintus Ennius which is believed to refer to the mass cremation following the battle of Heraclea in 280 BCE:¹⁰⁷

*incedunt arbusta per alta, securibus caedunt,
percellunt magnas quercus, exciditur ilex,
fraxinus frangitur atque abies consternitur alta,
pinus proceras pervortunt: omne sonabat
arbustum fremitu silvai frondosai.* (Skutsch, VI.ix.175-9)¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁶ *Argonautika*, 1.143, 2.849; Idmon (whether fathered by Abas or Apollo) was descended from Aeolus through his mother, Asteria, who was a great-granddaughter of Sisyphus, one of the sons of Aeolus. Idmon would therefore be a remote nephew of Odysseus, if the latter is accepted as a son of Sisyphus. Cf. also Fränkel (1968), pp. 35, 50.

¹⁰⁷ Skutsch (1985), p. 341.

Although only these five lines of Ennius relating to the construction of a pyre survive, the similarities to Vergil's description of the collection of wood for Misenus' funeral are striking, for the trees are located in the 'deep' wood and 'felled with axes' with much attendant 'noise'. Interestingly, although the only type of tree mentioned in the *Iliad* is the oak (δρῦς, 23.118), Ennius names five different types of tree, whilst Vergil uses seven different words to describe the trees felled for Misenus' pyre. Vergil's *variatio*, however, is largely in vocabulary rather than species, since the *picea* (6.180) and the *abies* are related, the *robur* (6.181, 214) can be equated with Ennius' *quercus*, and the *taedae* (6.214) are also related to the *piceae* (6.180).¹⁰⁹ Indeed, it must be certain that Vergil would have been more concerned with diversity and poetic differentiation than with botanic specificity, and is here indulging in a virtuoso display of arboreal vocabulary for his readers' delectation. Significantly, the only species introduced by Vergil is the cypress (*cupressos*, 6.216), which is characteristic of Roman funerals.¹¹⁰

In this passage, another metapoetic element may also be perceived. Hinds sees the Trojans' entry into the ancient wood (6.179: *itur in antiquam silvam*) as announcing Vergil's 'intervention in archaic Roman poetry', specifically the *Annales* of Ennius.¹¹¹ Furthermore, the felling of the trees represents, according to Horsfall, Vergil's triumph in this encounter, demonstrating 'the ways in which Latin has been polished since the days of Ennius'.¹¹² Finally, it is also worth noting that the preparations for the mass funerals at 11.133-8 follow a pattern which recalls not only the Homeric and Ennian models, but also Misenus' funeral several books previously. In Book 11, Vergil uses five words for the trees felled, three of which (*fraxinus*, *robora*, *ornos*) are identical to those mentioned in connexion with Misenus, one (*pinos*) is similar to the *abies* and *picea*, and one (*cedrum*) has affinities with both pine and cypress.¹¹³

5.7 Symbolism in the funeral

In addition to the metapoetical associations discussed above, the death and funeral of Misenus are also laden with other significance beyond the merely literal. Again,

¹⁰⁸ Skutsch (1985), p. 86; also cited by Norden (1927), p. 187, note to 6.179 ff.

¹⁰⁹ It seems likely that educated Roman readers would have recognized that many of these trees are of similar appearance and would therefore have appreciated the richly varied vocabulary. In modern taxonomy, several of these words are combined, so: *picea abies* is the Norway spruce, *pinus taeda* the loblolly pine, *quercus robur* the common oak and *quercus ilex* the holm oak.

¹¹⁰ Servius on 6.216, citing also Varro.

¹¹¹ Hinds (1998), p. 13.

¹¹² Horsfall (2013), Vol. 2, p. 185, paragraph (vi).

¹¹³ Most cedars are members of the cypress family, some are in the pine family.

Vergil's emulation of his greatest predecessor can be seen as a factor. In Book 23 of the *Iliad*, the funeral of Patroclus is characterized by excess and exceptional scale, reflecting 'the immensity of Akhilleus' grief'.¹¹⁴ Yet however great Achilles' grief may have been at the loss of his closest companion, the spectacular funeral accorded to Patroclus is understandably considered by some scholars to go well beyond what is appropriate for one ordinary mortal hero. Two additional dimensions have therefore been suggested. One suggestion is that the episode is a proleptic device to permit the portrayal of the funeral of the greatest warrior of all, which cannot be described directly in the *Iliad* since the poem ends with the death and funeral of Hector before the fall of Troy. Accordingly, just as the live Patroclus fought in battle as a proxy for Achilles, so the dead Patroclus fulfils a similar rôle in the funeral. Consequently, Achilles' 'special degree of closeness to Patroklos ... seems to approach identity',¹¹⁵ and thus 'les funérailles de Patrocle sont celles qu' Achille célèbre aussi pour lui-même'.¹¹⁶ Indeed, after the death of Achilles, the remains of both individuals are destined to reside in a single urn and a single tomb – inseparable in life, indistinguishable in death. At the same time, a second suggestion is that the mourning and burial of Patroclus, as well as that of Hector in Book 24, 'are, in a sense, not only for these two heroes but for everyone in the poem'.¹¹⁷ Both of these suggestions are convincing and are entirely compatible mutually.

While Misenus' funeral is not characterized by the same degree of excess as that of Patroclus, it does nevertheless go beyond what would seem appropriate for a single individual whose identity and background has been shown to be somewhat unclear. Consequently, it must be reasonable to consider whether there may not also be additional dimensions to this episode. Not surprisingly, other dimensions can indeed be found in relation to the death and funeral of Misenus. Clearly, Misenus is not to Aeneas what Patroclus was to Achilles, nor can Aeneas' own death be presaged in this episode,¹¹⁸ so no individual candidate is readily identifiable amongst the characters of the *Aeneid*. There are, however, some pointers within Book 6 which indicate that the death of Misenus alludes to a specific event contemporary with the composition of the *Aeneid*. The location of Misenus' death on the beach somewhere in the vicinity of

¹¹⁴ Richardson (1993), pp. 165 (Introduction to Book 23), 188, note to 23.166-76; cf. also Schapp-Gourbeillon (1982), p. 80: 'extraordinaire sumptuosité'.

¹¹⁵ Seaford (1994), p. 166.

¹¹⁶ Schnapp-Gourbeillon (1982), p. 86; see also: Schein (1984), p. 155; Seaford (1994), p. 157.

¹¹⁷ Schein (1984), p. 67.

¹¹⁸ Hejduk (2001), p. 93, suggests that Aeneas' 'watery death' is presaged in a number of places in the *Aeneid*, but a passing mention of Misenus (p. 96) is not developed in this connexion.

Cumae is close to Baiae, on the Gulf of Naples, where Augustus' nephew and son-in-law, Marcellus, had died, like Misenus, unexpectedly and prematurely (at the age of 19) in 23 BCE.¹¹⁹ Confirmation of this allusion, if needed, is provided at the end of the parade of heroes in the Underworld through the specific reference to Marcellus, placed by way of apostrophe in the mouth of Anchises (6.883: *tu Marcellus eris*). Furthermore, it cannot have escaped the notice of particularly alert contemporary readers/listeners that the names Marcellus and Misenus have the same initial letter, same number of syllables, same ending, and same vowel quantities, such that Marcellus could be read for Misenus throughout the Book without affecting the metre.¹²⁰ Additionally, it seems equally reasonable to accept at the same time that 'the rites for Mis. are clearly to be understood as honouring all the casualties of the journey'.¹²¹ Numerous Trojans have died in the course of their wanderings, notably those who perished in the storms described in Book 1, but up to this point the narrative has not portrayed any sort of formal cremation and burial ritual for any of them. It is therefore fitting that upon their first landfall on the mainland of western Italy, Aeneas should provide a magnificent funeral on 'home soil' not solely for a single individual, but for all who have previously died, perhaps also looking ahead to the many more dead who will be buried anonymously in a mass grave in Book 11. As in the case of Patroclus' funeral, both views of the symbolic significance of Misenus' funeral are valid and mutually compatible.

5.8 Conclusion: the purpose and function of the Misenus episode

As has been shown, although Misenus' funeral is influenced by its Homeric predecessor, as well as by others, it is nevertheless quite different in a number of important respects. Whereas Patroclus' funeral is extended, constitutes part of the concluding events of the *Iliad*, and serves to show Achilles' immense personal grief through scale and brutality, Misenus' funeral, set in the middle of the poem, is none of these, except in so far as it has scale. Nor does the funeral have obvious causal implications for subsequent events in the poem. Moreover, whilst the preparatory

¹¹⁹ Clark (1977a), p. 69, in the context of a discussion which provides interesting detail concerning locations and distances, and which examines the issue of 'topographical awkwardness' (pp. 69 n. 21, 70) posed by a rigorous examination of the logistics implied by the local geography.

Baiae is roughly equidistant (no more than three miles as the crow flies) from both Cumae and the headland named after Misenus.

¹²⁰ *Mārcēllūs* (6.855, 881); *Mīsēnūs* (3.239, 6.234), *Mīsēnē* (6.189); in the accusative the final syllable is elided on each occasion (6. 162, 164, 212), the first two syllables remaining long.

¹²¹ Horsfall (2013), p. 167, §2(a).

wood-gathering activity is interrupted by the discovery of the Golden Bough, the description of the funeral ritual itself, unlike that of Patroclus, is not interrupted by subsidiary episodes, and is beautifully concise. Aeneas is, of course, the principal mourner, but he is not prominent in the proceedings in the way that Achilles is at the funeral of Patroclus. Similarly, neither any of the other principal mortal followers of Aeneas nor any of the gods is involved. The focus of the episode is very much on the ritual. Before and during the ceremony the lamentation which takes place is deeply moving, but as has been demonstrated above, it is all for a man who remains something of a cipher.

In consequence, we are led to seek answers to the questions posed at the beginning of this chapter, namely why it should be Misenus whom Vergil chooses to die and what purpose and function Misenus' death and funeral serve in Book 6 of the *Aeneid*. To answer those questions, it will be useful to review the different levels on which the Misenus episode, viewed as a whole, engages the reader, including literal, dramatic, intertextual and allusive, metapoetic, and symbolic.

On the literal narrative plane, the episode is an important part of the short strategic pause following the arrival at Cumae at the beginning of Book 6, corresponding to perhaps twenty-four hours in the poem's time-line.¹²² During this interval, dramatic suspense is built up in anticipation of the descent to the Underworld, which constitutes the climax of the first half of the *Aeneid*, and which the reader is expecting following the instruction which Aeneas is said to have received from the apparition of his father (5.722-40). Misenus' sudden death creates an obstacle, however, since the miasma it causes has to be cleansed as one of the preconditions imposed by the Sibyl before the visit to the Underworld can take place. At the same time, Vergil creates an atmosphere of solemnity against a background of all-too-real human mortality appropriate to the imminent κατάβασις. From the narratorial perspective, too, the wood-gathering of the Misenus episode provides an excellent opportunity for Aeneas to follow his mother's doves into the depth of the forest and thus to find and retrieve the Golden Bough, the critical gift for Proserpina which will unlock the entry to the Underworld for Aeneas while still alive and, more importantly, permit his return from the realm of the dead.

In terms of allusion and intertextuality, the Misenus episode evokes the work of several of Vergil's literary predecessors, including Homer, Apollonius Rhodius, Ennius, and no doubt other poets whose work has only survived in fragments or not at all, such

¹²² Heinze (1915), p. 341 provides a reliable chronology for Book 6.

as Naevius and perhaps Stesichorus. In recalling these works to the minds of readers, Vergil both honours the memory of his forebears and, at the same time, seeks to demonstrate his own poetic prowess by adapting and elaborating his models in different narrative circumstances. Readers are invited to compare and admire as Vergil engages in literary *aemulatio*, vying to be a worthy, if not better epic successor, just as Aeneas was struggling to succeed Anchises. Hence, the Homeric character Elpenor is evoked in such a way that Vergil's poetic manipulation is not entirely revealed until near the end of the stories of Palinurus and Misenus, who both resemble and are different from Elpenor. Similarly, with the literary funerals evoked, differences of ethos, location within the poem, and especially the richer descriptive language are as important as, if not more important than, the similarities which Vergil highlights.

Beneath the surface of the Misenus episode, it is also possible to perceive metaliterary significance. Quite early in the episode, Misenus' musical talent is recognized through the use of the same vocabulary of songs and singing as ancient poets apply to their own artistic output. Concern about the possibility of being overwhelmed by the vast ocean of previous epic suggests that, however much Vergil might have been vying to be a worthy successor in the literary tradition by displaying his poetic prowess relative to earlier poets, he is also conscious of the awesome power of his predecessors, especially Homer, and may even betray some personal insecurity in this respect. An important related metapoetic element returns later in the poem, again linking Misenus with other bards and with Vergil himself. This reprise is illustrative of the way Vergil often weaves recurrent threads through his work. It is the designation of Misenus as Aeolides which is effective here. At the time of its first mention, the designation may seem slightly strange, perhaps evoking the keeper of the winds rather more than the descendants of the mythical king of Thessaly. Later, however, through the reappearance of the designation in relation to Clytius, along with mention of a well-attested Aeolid, Cretheus, Vergil incites (to use Lyne's terminology again) the reader to think back, especially since Cretheus is described as a bard. Here again, some insecurity on Vergil's part may be showing through when the bard is slain in a frenzy of barbaric *furor*.

Religious and related symbolism play an important part in the Misenus episode, even though none of the gods features during the funeral, and indeed Vergil invites readers to be sceptical concerning a possible divine responsibility for Misenus' death. Solemn ceremony surrounds the preparation and execution of the funeral. The episode

is, however, not just full of religious significance, but carries even greater symbolic meaning. Vergil's considerable detail in the description of the ceremonial draws attention to the primarily Roman nature of the ritual. Misenus' funeral is hugely important symbolically because it is the first Roman funeral to be conducted for any individual on the soil of mainland Italy, and the first death to provide a Trojan-Roman aetiology for any part of the Italian coast.¹²³ Moreover, the mainly Roman character of the proceedings emphasizes the almost complete metamorphosis of the *Aeneadae* from Trojan exiles into Romans. This transformation had been developing progressively throughout Book 5, visible at various points during the commemorative games, which culminate in the *Lusus Troiae*, an equestrian display familiar to Romans of the early principate.

At the same time, one of the last ritual actions of the funeral is absolutely critical for the next stage of the narrative, namely the purification, performed by the unknown Corynaeus. Not only does the lustration metaphorically wash away the miasma caused by Misenus' death, thereby fulfilling one of the Sibyl's preconditions, but it also symbolically cleanses Aeneas and his followers of their previous individual and collective transgressions, including notably the sojourn at Carthage, and thus prepares them to embark 'untainted' upon the war in Latium. Furthermore, this purification constitutes the culmination of a series of religious events, especially death-related events, which stretch back to the beginning of Book 5, namely the funeral (however sketchily drawn) and commemorative games for Anchises, the loss of Palinurus, presumed dead at that point, and finally the death and funeral of Misenus. Each of these events contributes to the progressive strengthening of Aeneas' *pietas* in preparation both for his journey to visit Anchises and for the completion of his divinely ordained mission.

Although these diverse poetic levels serve to explain the principal purposes and functions of the Misenus episode, they do not account entirely satisfactorily for why Vergil has chosen to describe, at this important point in the poem immediately before the portentous descent to the Underworld, the funeral of a character whose identity is somewhat obscure. Complete anonymity would not have been appropriate for a magnificent Roman funeral, but beneath the ostensible pedigree accorded to Misenus as a prominent Trojan Vergil weaves around him various nebulous and complex associations which tend to obscure rather than clarify who Misenus really was. Misenus

¹²³ Palinurus probably died before Misenus, but his burial and the naming of Capo Palinuro took place later.

has sufficient by way of heroic association to warrant the fine ceremony accorded him whilst remaining still something of a mystery character. This is the first burial on the Italian mainland, which is to be the new *patria* of the Roman people. Misenus is therefore accorded his Roman funeral as representative of all those who have perished during the seven years of *casus* and *errores*, and who (excluding those who died in the sea) had to be cremated and/or buried on foreign soil, often no doubt without any sort of enduring memorial or perhaps even appropriate funerary ritual. Moreover, the similarity of the preparations for the mass cremations in Book 11 with those for the funeral of Misenus links those two events. Returning now, however, to Neptune's utterance at 5.814-5, it is not difficult to incline to the view that (subject to correcting his transposition error) Servius was perhaps right in suggesting that Neptune was referring not to one, but to two individuals. Misenus is the sole person who is given individual burial with full honours in the place of many others, before and after him, thereby fulfilling Neptune's prediction: *unum pro multis dabitur caput*. Anachronistically, the modern concept of the 'unknown warrior' comes to mind.

Finally, the explicit reference to Marcellus and the powerful lament for his death in the culminating lines of the parade of heroes, causes the reader to recall subtler references earlier in the book, the place of death, the unexpected nature of the event, and the similarity of the names. Symbolically, therefore, not just the famous *manibus date lilia plenis* (6.883), but also the death and ritual cremation and burial of Misenus, can be read as a funerary tribute *in memoriam Marcelli*.

6. Vates tres: Apollo, the Sibyl, and the poet

Close to the beginning of Book 6, even before her first appearance, the Sibyl, Deiphobe, is advertised as a mysterious and potentially frightening individual. While Aeneas' followers are still foraging near their landing place, he himself sets out as follows:

..., horrendaeque procul secreta Sibyllae,

antrum immane, petit, magnam cui mentem animumque

Delius inspirat vates aperitque futura. (6.10-12)

In these three lines, the Sibyl is thus briefly characterized as a reclusive *vates* inspired with the gift of prophecy by Delian Apollo. Readers are therefore reminded that previously Helenus, himself referred to four times as a *vates*, had described the Sibyl as a *vates* (twice) in a somewhat longer account of her prophetic capability and her idiosyncrasies (3.441-52).¹ The supernatural powers of *vates* and their association with Phoebus Apollo are an important element in the scenes which bring the narrative of the poem towards the end of the Transitional Section and thus to the moment when Aeneas and the Sibyl will pass into the Underworld.

When, therefore, the Sibyl actually bursts upon the scene, readers have been prepared for her prophetic trance, the renewed influence and virtual presence of Apollo, references to real and fictional temples, and the use of vatic vocabulary. All of these contribute to the creation of a mystic atmosphere by way of backdrop for the religious rituals which are to take place. At the same time, most of these factors, as I shall argue, also point strongly towards the possibility of a metapoetic interpretation of two of the most important scenes in this section of the poem immediately prior to Aeneas' descent to the Underworld, namely Aeneas' first audience with the Sibyl (6.33-155) and the Golden Bough episode (6.185-211). Of especial note here is that temple references in Aeneas' appeal to the Sibyl recall the metapoetic temple in Vergil's own earlier poetry, at the beginning of the third book of the *Georgics*, where the poet addresses Apollo (*pastor ab Amphryso: Georgics* 3.2),² and proclaims his ambition firstly to bring the

¹ Helenus as *vates*: 3.358, 433, 463, 712; the Sibyl: 3.443, 456.

² A *recherché* designation echoed later in the *Aeneid* when the Sibyl is referred to as *Amphrysia vates* (6.398): Williams (1972), p. 483, note *ad loc.*; Fletcher (2012).

Muses to his own country in triumph (*Georgics* 3.10-11) and then to compose an epic in honour of Octavian (*Georgics* 3.16). Surprisingly, despite the proliferation of scholarly attention to parts of this section of the *Aeneid*, a metapoetic perspective of these two scenes, complementing other symbolic and allegorical interpretations, does not appear to be evidenced in the wide range of literature reviewed.

Following the Daedalus ekphrasis, five closely interwoven scenes bring the Transitional Section to its conclusion as the Sibyl bids Aeneas draw his sword (6.260) and summon his courage (6.261). Given, however, that aspects of the two scenes concerning Misenus have already been discussed in the previous chapter, this chapter concentrates, after the first section on structural matters, upon the three scenes which are intertwined with the Misenus scenes, and which feature the Sibyl directly or indirectly, namely the arrival of the prophetess (6.33-155), the collection of the Golden Bough (6.185-211), and the completion of the sacrifices to propitiate the gods of the Underworld (6.236-61). As will become apparent, Apollo's unseen participation here is particularly apt and significant, not only in his capacity as god of prophecy, music and poetry, but also because of his special status as Augustus' patron deity, and in view of his indirect association with the Underworld through the chthonic manifestation of the threefold character of his twin sister Diana-Trivia-Hecate (*caeloque Ereboque potentem*: 6.247).³ In her rôle as priestess of Trivia as well as of Apollo (6.35), therefore, the Sibyl also incorporates a chthonic link.

Scholarship on the Sibyl and especially on the Golden Bough has been prolific, as witness the extensive bibliographies included within the main text of Horsfall's commentary on Book 6.⁴ Following examination of many of these contributions, however, one of my particular aims in this chapter, as stated above, is to propose a perspective which appears not to have been treated at all, or not at any rate in any degree of depth, specifically the possibility of a metapoetic interpretation of the first two of the three scenes covered by this chapter.

6.1 Structure, time, and location

Quin protinus omnia | perlegerent oculis (6.33-4) are the brusque words which announce the arrival of the Sibyl, along with Achates, thereby bringing the Trojans'

³ Green (2000), p. 44, gives a useful, succinct summary of Diana's tripartite nature.

⁴ Horsfall (2013), pp. 70-1, preceding notes on 'Sibyl(s) and cave(s)'; p. 113, preceding notes on 'Palatine Apollo; the Sibylline books'; p. 142, preceding notes on '*Katabaseis*'; p. 157, following notes on 'The Golden Bough; introduction'.

perusal of the images on the doors of the temple of Apollo to a sudden end in the middle of a line. Without any form of greeting, the Sibyl immediately launches into the equally brusque: *non hoc ista sibi tempus spectacula poscit* (6.37). Through the words *hoc ... tempus* the narrative is also at once repositioned in the fictitious present of the poem after the complex chronology inherent in the imaginary *spectacula* supposed to have been sculpted by Daedalus, as discussed in Chapter 4.

Immediately after the brief introductory lines of Book 6, while the main body of the Trojans was busying itself foraging, *pius* Aeneas had set out to climb up the gradient towards Apollo's temple at Cumae (6.9-12), where he and unspecified companions lingered to stare in wonder at the magnificently sculpted doors (6.33-4). During the interactions with the Sibyl which follow her interruption of this brief interlude, Apollo makes no physical appearance, but his influence, with complex associations, is pervasive. Previously in the poem Apollo's influence has been of considerable importance, for it is his prophecies in Book 3, delivered through various channels, albeit sometimes imperfectly interpreted, which guide (and mislead) the *Aeneadae* in the early stages of their journey.⁵ Subsequently, his influence continues to be strong both in the fictitious present of the poem (as in the account of the guidance given to Ascanius at 9.638-58, the only time Apollo makes a physical appearance in the poem) and in the projected future corresponding to Vergil's own time (as in his imagined rôle at Actium, depicted on Aeneas' shield at 8.704-6).⁶ Yet, after Book 3, Apollo is no longer in evidence for some considerable time. His oracles are adduced in Book 4 as reasons for Aeneas' hurried departure from Carthage,⁷ but no mention at all is made of him throughout the whole of Book 5. Apollo's influence then reasserts itself early in Book 6, just as, following an extended period of quiescence, four of the other Olympian gods, Juno, Jupiter, Venus, and Neptune, had returned to the stage in the concluding scenes of Book 5.

Commencing at this point are the five scenes, running from 6.33 to 6.235, which conclude the Transitional Section, and which complete Aeneas' religious and psychological preparation for his visit to the Underworld. Geographical features of the area around Cumae have attracted the attention of various scholars, who have sought to

⁵ See O' Hara (1990), *passim*, but especially Introduction, pp. 3-6, and Chapter 5, pp. 176-84, concerning 'deceptively optimistic prophecies' (p. 4) liable to mislead their recipients.

⁶ Miller (2009), p. 98, with n. 7, observes: 'No deity is mentioned more often in the poem except for Jupiter'.

⁷ Grynean Apollo and the Lycian oracles twice, at 4.345 and 4.376; Apollo is also mentioned in a simile at 4.144.

identify places and itineraries with some precision, as may be suggested by the footnotes, below, relating to locations mentioned.⁸ What is important here, however, for my thesis, is not topographical accuracy, which cannot be achieved with certainty, but the rapid changes of scene within a short span of time. Although these five scenes provide a chronologically sequential narrative, shifts of location and focus have the effect of disrupting the flow. These scenes also exhibit an interesting structural symmetry, as follows: (i) Aeneas and the Sibyl on the Cumaean heights outside, then inside, the temple of Apollo, and then at the threshold of her cavern (6.33-155);⁹ (ii) discovery of Misenus' body by Aeneas and Achates on an unspecified seashore, perhaps near the landing place at Cumae (6.156-84);¹⁰ (iii) discovery of the Golden Bough in a forest not far from the jaws of Avernus (6.185-211);¹¹ (iv) cremation of Misenus, on a seashore, presumably close to his tumulus at the eponymous promontory, rather than where his body was found (6.212-35);¹² (v) the Sibyl and Aeneas near the entrance to the Underworld close to a dark lake (6.236-61).¹³ Acquisition of the Golden Bough, the critical talisman facilitating Aeneas' entry to and exit from the kingdom of Dis and Proserpina, is thus given a special prominence, doubly nested as it is between the two scenes relating to Misenus, which in turn are embraced by the two scenes in which both the Sibyl and Aeneas are present together. Even though the purification achieved by the burial of Misenus was stipulated by the Sibyl as a prior condition for the *κατάβασις* (6.136-43), so must be mentioned at this point, the relative length of the two scenes featuring Misenus, together with the variety introduced by this quasi-dramatic sequence of scenes has the effect of slowing the pace of the main narrative, thereby generating suspense amongst readers who are already anticipating the entry to the Underworld.

⁸ The most comprehensive study is McKay (1972), particularly 'Avernus: Lago Averno', pp. 7-30, 231-2, and 'Cumae: Cuma', pp. 123-72, 244-9, with plans, maps, and photographs.

⁹ Galinsky (2009); Miller (2009), p. 137: 'their exact route [from temple to cavern] remains a thorny problem'.

¹⁰ Norden (1927), p. 182, note to 6.156-74, has Aeneas and Achates walk from Cumae towards Misenum before finding the body. McKay (1967), p. 6, states that Misenus 'drowned in the waters of Baiæ'. In both instances, the implication must be that Misenus had left the foraging-party or the group around the temple doors, and wandered some distance (see further note, below) before issuing his fatal challenge.

¹¹ Clark (1992), pp. 167-78, for a detailed, but not entirely convincing, discussion of the location of the Golden Bough.

¹² McKay (1967), pp. 6-8, provides a description, with illustration (fig. 2, facing p. 11), of the area around Misenum; Clark (1977a), p. 64, points out that Cape Misenum is approximately five miles from Cumae, so concludes (p. 70) that either the body was carried there (unnarrated) while Aeneas was finding the Golden Bough, or the preposition in the expression *monte sub aërio* (6.234) is used loosely. The former seems more satisfactory.

¹³ Lake Avernus, referred to earlier at 6.201. The line here which specifies the name (*Aornon*: 6.242) is considered spurious: Norden (1927), p. 202; Williams (1972), pp. 473-4.

6.2 *Adsunt tres vates*

Three-quarters of the first scene under consideration in this chapter (6.33-155) are taken up by direct speech,¹⁴ being a quasi-dramatic exchange between Aeneas and the Sibyl which is rather grandiose and formal in style, reminiscent of speeches in much later ‘classical theatre’, such as by Racine or Alfieri. Each delivers two longish speeches, Aeneas in prayer and supplication (of equal length: 6.56-76, 103-23), the Sibyl in prophecy and admonition (6.83-97, 125-55). Interestingly, in need here of the active assistance of the Sibyl, Aeneas enters into a real dialogue with her, contrary to his more usual ‘taciturnity’, as characterized by Denis Feeney and Susanna Morton Braund, and exemplified particularly by his failure to engage with Dido in the confrontation with her in the latter part of Book 4.¹⁵ Here, however, in order to obtain co-operation from the Sibyl, and in no position to issue the laconic commands of a leader ‘burdened by the responsibilities on his shoulders’,¹⁶ as is his wont, Aeneas displays a degree of diplomacy and eloquence which is only matched elsewhere in the *Aeneid* when he addresses Evander (8.127-51), requesting military aid and describing himself aptly and uncharacteristically as a suppliant (8.145). This lively exchange between Aeneas and the Sibyl has the effect of bringing the situation more alive for the reader.

In the Sibyl’s prophecy (6.83-97), she tells Aeneas very little that he has not heard previously, albeit in less vivid language, from other sources. That he will have to face an Italic Achilles (6.89) is a new detail, but hardly a surprise. Two new pieces of information are imparted. Firstly, Aeneas is told that after seeking allies (6.92), he will obtain help from a Greek city (6.97). Then, almost as an afterthought towards the end of her second speech, the Sibyl tells Aeneas that one of his comrades is dead (6.149-51). Of particular note in this scene, however, is the frequency with which the word *vates* and related vocabulary appear.

Before continuing further, it is worth noting that the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, as is appropriate for an analytical dictionary, gives quite separately two meanings of *vates*, that is, ‘prophet/seer’ and ‘poet/bard’.¹⁷ In the *Aeneid* as a whole, the word *vates* is used 36 times, usually referring to a specific individual with the gift of prophecy, such as Cassandra, Helenus, and the Sibyl (the word is used generically only five times). Of

¹⁴ On the basis of Highet (1972), p. 295: of 122⁵/₁₂ lines: 31¹/₁₂ narrative, 40⁵/₆ Aeneas, 50¹/₂ the Sibyl.

¹⁵ Feeney (1983); Braund (1998); also, Highet (1972), p. 38: ‘he does not converse’.

¹⁶ Braund (1998), p. 137.

¹⁷ OLD2E (2012), Vol. 2, p. 2221, s.v. *uates*: ‘1. A prophet, seer (regarded as the mouthpiece of the deity possessing him)’, and ‘2. A poet (regarded as divinely inspired), bard’.

these 36 occurrences, however, Book 6 has a disproportionate share, totalling sixteen.¹⁸ Four of these instances are to be found in this first scene (6.33-155), where the word occurs in close association with vocabulary describing functions and attributes of a *vates* appropriate to both meanings (mostly words in *can-*, *cant-*, *carm-*). Given the context in the presence of the Sibyl, this concentration of such words in a passage of only 122½ lines may not immediately attract particular attention, but a closer look rewards the effort.

At this point, it is useful to consider the semantic history of the word *vates*. Before Vergil's time, this term had apparently been understood to be somewhat disparaging, as for example in Ennius and Lucretius, who both expressed scepticism as to the competence and effectiveness of *vates*.¹⁹ Similar usage also continued amongst later prose writers such as Vergil's younger contemporary, Livy.²⁰ Use of the word by Vergil twice in the *Eclogues*, in close proximity to the word *poeta* is not, however, obviously pejorative.²¹ Moreover, the juxtaposition of the two words gives emphasis to a differentiation of meaning. In fact, in his commentary, Robert Coleman indicates that *vates* has 'more prestigious connotations', contrasting with the 'more modest *poeta*'.²² Similarly, Wendell Clausen states that *vates* exactly served Vergil's purpose, being a 'more elevated word meaning "poet"', with 'antique dignity'.²³ Following on from this, the four mentions of *vates* in the *Georgics* appear not to carry obviously adverse connotations.²⁴ The first instance (3.491) may perhaps be considered neutral, even though the *vates* is shown to be powerless in the face of a plague,²⁵ but the other three mentions refer to the sea-god Proteus, admittedly a difficult individual, but of whom it is said by the sea-nymph, Cyrene: *novit ... omnia vates* (4.392). Subsequent use in the *Aeneid* continues to be positive, as is confirmed particularly when, in the Groves of the Fortunate (*fortunatorum nemorum*: 6.639), amongst the *pii vates*, Aeneas sees Musaeus

¹⁸ Book 3 has eight mentions, Book 7 four, Books 4, 5, and 8 two each, Books 1 and 11 one each.

¹⁹ Ennius, *Annales*, 7.206-7, in Skutsch (1986), p. 88, annotated (pp. 371-2) as having a 'contemptuous note' and 'disparaging tone'; Lucretius, *De rerum natura*, 1.102-6. See also Hardie (1986), pp. 17, 22.

²⁰ Montanari, (1976), p. 244-7, citing Livy 4.30.9, 25.1.8, and 39.8.3.

²¹ *Eclogues*, 7.28 (with *poeta* in 7.25), 9.34 (with *poeta* in 9.32).

²² Coleman (1977), p. 214, note to *Eclogue* 7.28; also Hardie (1998), p. 18; but O' Hara (1990), p. 179, detects some negativity in that Thyrsis is vanquished by Corydon in the contest of *Eclogue* 7, while in *Eclogue* 9 Lycidas 'is just learning that poetry and song do not have the power to influence the real world'.

²³ Clausen (1994), pp. 277-8, note to *Eclogue* 9.32-6, opining also that 'Much, too much perhaps, has been made of the distinction between *poeta* and *vates*'.

²⁴ *Georgics*, 3.491, 4.387, 392, 450.

²⁵ Newman (1967), p. 27: 'The blame for the situation is not his'; O' Hara (1990), p. 180, however, again detects a degree of negativity in the situation.

(6.662-7), one of the legendary ‘founders’ of Greek poetry, whom the Sibyl then addresses as *optime vates* (6.669).²⁶

In the wake of Vergil’s ‘revival’ of the term, subsequent uses by Horace, who fairly quickly adopted the term in *Epodes* 16 and 17,²⁷ and other Augustan poets had the effect of modifying somewhat the semantic bias of *vates* in poetry, the former pejorative associations being attenuated. John K Newman, in his work on the concept of *vates* in Augustan poetry, sees the two meanings of the word as initially quite distinct,²⁸ but with the semantic boundaries becoming blurred at some points in the *Aeneid*, and the negative colouring being abandoned.²⁹ James O’ Hara argues, however, that the negative associations of *vates* cannot have disappeared altogether, and that the ‘inherent ambiguity of the figure of the *vates* is well suited to the ambiguity of the *Aeneid*’.³⁰ Indeed, an educated reader is unlikely to compartmentalize meanings in the same way as a dictionary.³¹ Hence, in responding to such a word, where the two meanings are closely related, it seems unlikely that one meaning can be read without ‘harmonics’ of the other resonating at the same time, tinged perhaps with a lingering memory of the earlier pejorative connotations. A degree of ambiguity, therefore, obtains, not of discrete different meanings, but of intermingling complementary meanings together with legacy overtones. Moreover, as is demonstrated below, Vergil exploits the word’s two facets of meaning, slurring the distinction between prophet/seer and poet/bard, with perhaps some persisting element of scepticism.

Although Aeneas and the Sibyl are ostensibly the protagonists of this first scene, behind the Sibyl is the invisible influence of Apollo. His virtual presence cannot be ignored, for his temple is close at hand and the Sibyl is his priestess and the vehicle of his prophecies. Yet, while Apollo (once) and the Sibyl (several times) are explicitly referred to as *vates*,³² it seems reasonable to suggest that a third *vates* also stands

²⁶ Although the other legendary ‘founder’, Orpheus (*Threicus ... sacerdos*: 6.645), is not described as *vates*, he too is accorded an honourable place in the Groves of the Fortunate, where he is seen playing his lyre, demonstrating that music and poetry transcend death.

²⁷ *Epode* 16.66, referring to himself, and *Epode* 17.44, referring to Stesichorus. Newman (1967), pp. 23-4, refers to Vergil’s ‘neologism’ and discusses Horace’s subsequent use. Also, Jocelyn (1995), p. 19.

²⁸ Newman (1967), p. 25.

²⁹ Newman (1967), p. 38; Rüdiger von Tiedemann in *Der neue Pauly* offers the most positive definition: ‘*Vates ... bezeichnet den göttl. inspirierten, prophetisch wissenden, höchste Wahrheit verkündenden Dichter*’.

³⁰ O’ Hara (1990), pp. 178-9, 181.

³¹ Lovatt (2007), p. 146, albeit speaking about Statius, states: ‘this distinction between poet and prophet is foreign to the word itself: the *vates* is a poet-prophet’.

³² Apollo: 6.012, where the attributive adjective *Delius* also provides further resonance with the reference to *Delos* at *Georgics* 3.6; the Sibyl: 3.443, 456, 6.65, 78, 82, 125, 161, 189, 211, 259, 372, 398, 415, 419, 562.

alongside both of them, namely Vergil himself. Indeed, only a little later in the poem, in his invocation to the Muse Erato, Vergil applies the same designation to himself (*tu vatem, tu, diva [Erato], mone: 7.41*) as ‘the god-inspired teller of the story’.³³ He also demonstrates elsewhere that he both performs the actions (*cano: 1.1; adspirare [mihi] canenti: 9.525*) and generates the essential output of a *vates*, whose utterances are normally chanted or sung in verse (*carminibus nostris: 7.733; mea carmina: 9.446*).³⁴

Against this background, Aeneas’ first response to the Sibyl’s stricture (*cessas in vota precesque?: 6.51*) is especially interesting. Having opened with an invocation to Apollo (6.56-62) and other gods (6.63-5), Aeneas’ speech becomes, in the second half of 6.65, an address to the Sibyl which is longer (6.65-76) than his preceding prayers to the gods. In this address to the Sibyl, and in the lines which immediately follow, describing the Sibyl going into a trance (6.77-82), not only is *vates* used three times in the span of only eighteen lines (6.65-82), but other words are found which are associated with the rôle of seer.³⁵ What then stands out is that, with the possible exception of *responsa*, these words are also applicable to the rôle of bard. Here, then, is an example of the slurring of the semantic boundaries referred to above. Additional important factors are the vicinity to Apollo’s temple and, in view of the god’s close association not only with prophecy, but also with poetry and music, the virtual presence of the relevant deity.

6.3 Fictitious, real, and metapoetic temples

Along with the above-mentioned ambiguity in relation to the term *vates*, another Vergilian poetic phenomenon also manifests itself in this passage. As in the Daedalus ekphrasis, discussed in Chapter 4, the fictitious characters represented in narrative time may be taken not only at face value, but as representing also characters of Vergil’s contemporary world.³⁶ That characters and chronology are ‘interchangeable’ in this way is brought to readers’ attention through the principal subject matter of Aeneas’ first address to the Sibyl, specifically temples and sanctuaries (6.65-71). At the same time, this subject matter also highlights a close relationship with Vergil’s programmatic statement of intent at the beginning of the third book of the *Georgics*.

³³ Jocelyn (1995), p. 22. The word *poeta* does not occur in the *Aeneid*.

³⁴ By implication, also, in the invocation at 6.266: *sit mihi fas audita loqui*.

³⁵ *vates* (6.65, 78, 82); *dicta* (6.73); *carmina* (6.74); *canas* (6.76); *responsa* (6.82).

³⁶ Griffin (1985), p. 197 speaks of Vergil’s ‘brilliant exploitation of the device of presenting characters in the light of other characters’, having previously suggested (p. 191) that it was natural for Romans to ‘see through history’ and ‘to recognise one event or person in another’. Also, Powell (2008), pp. 24, 98.

Addressing the Sibyl, Aeneas promises her a separate sanctuary of her own and chosen men to oversee it (who, having originally been two in number, had by Augustan times become the fifteen *quindecimviri sacris faciundis*). Earlier in this speech, Aeneas had vowed a temple for Apollo and Diana Trivia, and a festival for Apollo. On the level of fiction, it is to be presumed that, in due course, given his piety, Aeneas will fulfil his vow (unnarrated) in Lavinium after the end of the poem. As in the Daedalus ekphrasis, however, the fictitious temple here calls to mind the Temple of Apollo Palatinus dedicated by Augustus in 28 BCE, which housed statues of both Apollo and Diana, along with their mother Latona.³⁷ The planned or actual transfer of the Sibylline Books to that temple, where they were kept under the base of the statue of Apollo, reinforces the allusion.³⁸ Thus, as John F Miller points out, all four promises made by Aeneas to Apollo and the Sibyl (temple, festival, sanctuary, preservation of the Sibylline books) correspond to activity undertaken by Octavian/Augustus in fulfilment or furtherance of Aeneas' pledges.³⁹ In addition to the Temple of Apollo Palatinus, some scholars have also argued for allusion to the Temple of Hercules of the Muses, constructed by Marcus Fulvius Nobilior following the capture of Ambracia when he was consul in 189 BCE.⁴⁰ Aptly for the present context, not only was Fulvius Nobilior the patron of the epic poet Quintus Ennius, but also the temple housed statues of the nine Muses. These literary associations with the older, republican temple have been developed further by Peter Heslin (see below).

In recalling the physical buildings of real, historical temples, however, the fictitious temple vowed by Aeneas also reminds readers of another temple, of equal if not greater significance, namely the metapoetic temple which Vergil himself had vowed to build earlier in his poetic career:

et viridi in campo templum de marmore ponam (*Georgics*, 3.13)

A striking similarity can be seen in the salient words of Aeneas' vow in the later poem, which is also expressed in the first person singular:

³⁷ Notes to 6.69 by: Servius; Conington/Nettleship (1884), p. 435; Fletcher (1941/66), p. 37; Austin (1977), p. 64; Williams (1972), p. 464; Horsfall (2013), p. 113 §(i).

³⁸ Suetonius, *Divus Augustus*, 31.1, seems to indicate that the transfer took place after Augustus assumed the office of Pontifex Maximus (12 BCE), but even if it took place after Vergil's death, he could have known of plans to move the books. Murgatroyd (1994), pp. 163-4, sets out strong arguments on the grounds of references in Tibullus (2.5.1, 2.5.17-18) for a date before 19 BCE; accepted by Harrison (2006), p. 171, and Miller (2009), p. 240 n. 118.

³⁹ Miller (2009), p. 97.

⁴⁰ Mynors (1990), p. 181, note to *Georgics* 3.13; Hardie, P (1998), p. 41; Hardie, A (2002), pp. 194-200; Hardie, P (2007), pp. 137-9.

*solido de marmore templum**instituam*

(Aeneid, 6.69-70)

Most recently, Heslin has suggested a more complex relationship between, on the one hand, the texts of both *Georgics* 3 and the *Aeneid*, and on the other hand not one, but two Augustan architectural structures, a relationship which he characterizes as a sort of ‘intertextuality’.⁴¹ In his interesting and well-argued interpretation, the fictitious, marble temples of *Georgics* 3 and *Aeneid* 6 evoke not only the Temple of Apollo Palatinus, but also the Portico of Philippus, built by Augustus’ step-brother and uncle by marriage, Lucius Marcius Philippus, also around 28 BCE.⁴² Heslin argues that the location of the promised Mantuan temple *in campo* and close to the meandering river Mincius (*Georgics* 3.13-15) is reminiscent of the location of the Portico at the southern end of the Campus Martius close to a bend of the river Tiber at Rome. The Portico is relevant because it was built around Fulvius Nobilior’s Temple of Hercules of the Muses with its statues of the Muses, and because it ‘offered a focal point for literary culture’ as the meeting place for ‘Rome’s guild of professional poets’.⁴³ Furthermore, taking up Vergil’s designation of himself as *victor*, clothed in purple, leading chariots in a triumphal procession (*Georgics* 3.17-18), Heslin draws attention to the usual route of triumphs, which would proceed from the Circus Flaminius in front of the Portico of Philippus to the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus. Hence, he argues that the triumph which begins in *Georgics* 3, but is incomplete, ends in Book 8 of the *Aeneid* where Augustus is seen reviewing the spoils of his triple triumph, albeit seated at the threshold not of Jupiter’s temple, but of that of his patron Apollo (8.720-1).⁴⁴ Temple and sanctuary promises in *Aeneid* 6, therefore, fit into a complex relationship with *Georgics* 3, which also links the (re-)building programme undertaken by Augustus and members of his circle with the sponsorship of literary culture.⁴⁵

Reference to a temple in the third book of the *Georgics*, in the context of the poet’s expressed intention firstly to bring the Muses to his own country, using the

⁴¹ Heslin (2015), p. 8.

⁴² Heslin (2015), p. 169; he also points out (p. 257, with n. 6 on p. 314) that these associations would have been even more evident to Vergil’s contemporaries in view of the fact that the *Georgics* were published at around the same time as the dedication of the Temple of Apollo Palatinus and completion of the Portico of Philippus.

⁴³ Heslin (2015), p. 201.

⁴⁴ Heslin (2015), pp. 259-60, pointing out, however, also (p. 314, n. 16) that the Temple of Apollo Palatinus was not dedicated until the year after Octavian’s triple triumph. Nevertheless, the more or less complete structure must already have existed.

⁴⁵ Heslin (2015) also links the images which Aeneas sees in the Temple of Juno at Carthage (1.453-93) with the Portico of Philippus and the post-Vergilian Temple of Apollo at Pompeii.

significant word *deducam* (*Georgics* 3.11), which carries both (meta)poetic and triumphal significance,⁴⁶ and secondly to achieve renown upon the lips of men (*virum volitare per ora*: *Georgics* 3.9), is generally taken to be a self-confident statement of poetic ambition, referring to an epic poem planned by Vergil for the future.⁴⁷ In the event, therefore, the *Aeneid* constitutes fulfilment of the poet's vow. Hence, through the vows to build temples in *Aeneid* 6, Vergil links Aeneas, Augustus and himself. In consequence, each of the three can be imagined to be addressing the Sibyl concerning, as the case requires, a fictitious, real, or metaphorical temple.⁴⁸ Moreover, the use of the first person singular both in the *Aeneid* and in the *Georgics* also aligns the speakers particularly closely (Aeneas/Augustus: *instituam*; Vergil: *ponam*).

Already in Book 6, as discussed in the previous chapter, metapoetic elements have been in evidence in the Daedalus ekphrasis. If, therefore, now, in rereading Aeneas' first words addressed directly to the Sibyl, promising a temple for Apollo and Diana Trivia, and a sanctuary for the Sibyl herself (6.65-74), the complementary ambiguity and semantic slurring of *vates* are borne in mind, along with the interchangeability of characters and chronology, as well as the real or virtual presence of three *vates*, the possibility of metapoetic and symbolic interpretation is strongly indicated alongside the literal meaning. Moreover, as will be demonstrated, the interchangeability can be seen as applicable to the addressee as well as to the speaker. Worth noting here, too, is that like the Daedalus ekphrasis which precedes this passage, both of the subsequent Misenus scenes, already discussed in Chapter 5.5 and 5.6, and (as will be argued in 6.4, below) the Golden Bough episode also contain metapoetic elements. Aeneas' address to the Sibyl is therefore enclosed between other passages of metapoetic significance.

As chief representative of the Trojan/Roman people Aeneas/Augustus sets out to the Sibyl, who may be seen as a representative of poets-*vates*, the position which ideally literature, particularly poetry, would occupy in a peaceful, civilized society, in conformity with Augustus' policies to re-establish traditional values and pursuits in Rome and its provinces. Beyond this exaltation of poetry in general, however, Aeneas' promise to the Sibyl may also bear a more personal interpretation relating to Vergil's own aspirations and self-image. Here, two possible interpretations come to mind, of which the second is considerably more attractive.

⁴⁶ For the poetic, significance of *deduco*: Thomas (1988b), Vol. 2, p. 40 (note to *Georgics* 3.11); for the military or triumphal significance: Mynors (1990), p. 180 (note to *Georgics* 3.11-12).

⁴⁷ Thomas (1988b), Vol. 2, pp. 36 (note to *Georgics* 3.1-48), 41 (note to 3.13); Mynors (1990), pp. 179, 181 (notes to *Georgics* 3.8-9, 13, 16).

⁴⁸ Deremetz (1995), pp. 157-65; Kofler (2003), pp. 53-61.

Firstly, Aeneas as representing both the Roman people and particularly its leader, Augustus, may be seen to be addressing not the Sibyl, but, adjusting for gender in the vocative *o sanctissima vates* (6.65), the third *vates*, Vergil. By analogy, therefore the poet is himself being honoured by the *Princeps*, who took great interest in the poem Vergil was writing. Such a bold claim to honour is a marked expression of poetic self-confidence, like the boast of the metaphorical temple made in *Georgics* 3. There, Vergil describes himself twice as *victor* (3.9, 17), thereby placing himself on the same level as Octavian (3.16). Moreover, he twice lays claim to primacy over both Ennius and Lucretius (*primus*: 3.10, 12), for he states that he will be the first both to bring the Muses from Greece to Italy in triumph (*deducam*: 3.11), and first also to bring from Idumaea (in modern-day Jordan or southern Israel) palms, which symbolize literary and triumphal prowess.⁴⁹ A parallel may also be found in the commemorative games in Book 5 of the *Aeneid*. In his description of the first sporting event, Vergil makes a similar metapoetic claim of superiority over the poet of the *Iliad* by asserting that the two-horse chariots which had competed in the funeral games for Patroclus (*Iliad* 23.257-623) were not so fast as the vessels in his ship-race (*non tam praecipites ... | ... currus*: 5.144-5).⁵⁰

An alternative interpretation, however, recommends itself more strongly. In addition to the first-person statements noted above (*instituam*; *ponam*), the vows of fictitious and metaphorical marble temples also suggest the identification here of Vergil not just with Augustus, but with the speaker, Aeneas. Thus, the poet may be seen as dedicating his poem to Apollo, the god of poetry, through the latter's representative the Sibyl, while also asserting the brilliance of his own creative genius. Despite declaring himself unconvinced, Miller sums up this association well: 'The allusion is usually said to make Aeneas a figure of the poet and his vowed shrine a symbol of the *Aeneid*'.⁵¹ Convincing arguments in favour of the Aeneas-Augustus-Vergil triple alignment are,

⁴⁹ Ennius' own epigrammatic 'epitaph' claims: *volito vivos per ora virum*, (Courtney (1993), p. 43, no. 46, line 2 = Vahlen (1903), p. 215, *Varia* 17), taken up by Vergil in *Georgics* 3 as *virum volitare per ora*: 3.9). Lucretius credits Ennius as being the first (*primus*: *De rerum natura* 1.117) to have brought to Italy a poet's crown from the seat of the Muses, who in Lucretius still dwell in Greece (Mount Helicon). As to himself, Lucretius claims primacy more subtly, saying that he has wandered through as yet untrodden paths of the Muses (*DRN* 1.926-7). Vergil claims to surpass both earlier poets by being first to bring the Muses to Italy. Thomas (1988b), Vol. 2, pp. 39-40 (notes to *Georgics* 3.10-15 and 11); Mynors (1990), p. 180 (note to *Georgics* 3.10-11). Hinds (1998), pp53-5, points out the implicit 'paradox' that in claiming to bring the Muses metaphorically to Italy Vergil alludes to Ennius, whose patron, Fulvius Nobilior, had brought physical statues of the Muses to Italy.

⁵⁰ See also discussion in Chapter 5.5, above.

⁵¹ Miller (2009), p. 140. Although Miller says 'usually', this possible alignment of Aeneas and Vergil is not mentioned by the major commentaries, including Conington/Nettleship (1884), Norden (1927), Fletcher (1941/66), Williams (1972), Austin (1977), Horsfall (2013).

however, offered by Alain Deremetz and Wolfgang Kofler. Moreover, while asserting that ‘*le héros lui-même semble pouvoir être considéré comme le représentant symbolique du poète*’, Deremetz also argues that the journey through the Underworld ‘*symbolise l’ itinéraire poétique que Virgile accomplit aux côtés de son héros*’.⁵² Kofler points out additionally that the temple of Palatine Apollo was endowed with a great library, arguing therefore that the temple itself symbolises a book, specifically the *Aeneid*.⁵³

Placing poetry in a shrine (*magna ... penetralia*: 6.71), or ‘on a pedestal’, to use a more modern idiom, may seem somewhat optimistic, so there may also be a hint of the sense that the utterances of *vates* are not always complete or accurate. As O’ Hara suggests, a mere ten years or thereabouts after what is now known to have been the final battle concluding a lengthy period of civil war, it may be that Vergil is expressing simultaneously ‘both the age’s hope for the peace of a Golden Age under Augustus, and its fear that this hope might be deceptive and illusory’.⁵⁴

Alignment of Aeneas with Vergil is particularly important for a metapoetic interpretation of the Golden Bough episode, which will be expounded below, after a selective review of other interpretations.

6.4 Plucking the recalcitrant Bough

More than thirty works are listed in the bibliography of the Golden Bough provided in Horsfall’s commentary.⁵⁵ All bar two of these have been published since the middle of the twentieth century.⁵⁶ In addition to these, the *Gnomon* and *L’ Année Philologique* databases have yielded only two titles published since the beginning of the present century, although these two items may possibly have been consciously omitted

⁵² Deremetz (1995), pp. 157, 161.

⁵³ Kofler (2003), p. 58.

⁵⁴ O’ Hara (1990), p. 6.

⁵⁵ Horsfall (2013), p. 157.

⁵⁶ It is assumed here that earlier scholarship has either been rejected in subsequent publications or taken up and further developed. Identification of the Golden Bough with mistletoe, pursued at some length by Norden following the anthropologist Sir James Frazer, is one of the few areas where the great German scholar’s interpretation has been abandoned without modification [see: Frazer (1913), Part VII, Vol. II, Chapter XII, pp. 279-303, especially p. 284; Norden (1927), pp. 163-8, especially p. 164; rejection summarized by West (1987), pp. 3-6 = West (1990) pp 225-30]. Nevertheless, some interest has been shown in the possible knowledge which Vergil may have had concerning mistletoe. Even two sub-species of mistletoe about which the poet could have had knowledge (and could have confused) have not escaped attention: *Viscum album* and *Loranthus Europaeus*: Wagenvoort (1959/80), pp. 95-6; Koch (1968). Préaux (1960) also focuses upon botanical detail. Salanitro (1997), although referring to species of mistletoe, is more concerned with the interpretation of *nova* and *quod* at 6.206.

by Horsfall.⁵⁷ Some of the contributions listed by Horsfall speculate concerning sources on which Vergil may have drawn in relating the episode of the Golden Bough and Aeneas' journey through the Underworld in company with the Sibyl. Amongst these, Bremmer has suggested that, after Homer's *vékuvā*, two lost poems concerning descents by Orpheus and by Hercules into the Underworld may have been important.⁵⁸ Other contributions listed by Horsfall explore the topography of the area where Aeneas finds the Bough. Yet others examine symbolic and mystic aspects of the Bough, particularly linking it with Eleusinian and Orphic ritual.⁵⁹ In the latter case, the association is underlined by the evident importance of gold in Orphic cult, as testified by inscribed leaves of gold found in various places in southern Italy and the Greek world.⁶⁰ As will be discussed below, much attention has also been given to the apparent reluctance of the Bough to be detached from its host (*cunctantem*: 6.211) despite the Sibyl's prediction that it would yield easily to Aeneas if the fates favoured him (6.146-7).

In providing the most recent overview of works concerning the Golden Bough, Horsfall's commentary reviews a wide range of interpretations put forward since the middle of the twentieth century.⁶¹ Naturally, he favours ideas put forward by himself,⁶² as well as those of one of his close collaborators, Jan Bremmer.⁶³ Concerning the central issue of the function of the Golden Bough and its linguistic and philosophical forbears, Horsfall also aligns himself closely with the seminal lecture delivered by David West at the University of Exeter in 1986, which establishes two of the most straightforward and generally convincing explanations.⁶⁴ According to West's interpretation, the Golden Bough represents Aeneas' passport through the Underworld in accordance with a procedure laid down by Proserpina herself (6.142-3).⁶⁵ Moreover,

⁵⁷ Cormier (2005), a further elaboration, in English, of Cormier (1988); Pârvulescu (2005), discussed below. On bibliographical comprehensiveness and 'bad books and articles' passed over 'in silence', see Horsfall (2013), Vol. 1, *Praemonenda*, §§ 7, 9, pp. xxxviii-ix.

⁵⁸ Bremmer (2009), pp. 183-4; following a brief review of the arguments, Horsfall (2013), pp. 142-4, within note to 6.120, supports the case for Vergil having been aware of literary accounts of the Orphic and Heracleian *katabaseis*; cf. also Herrero de Jáuregui (2015).

⁵⁹ Luck (1973); Bremmer (2009); Herrero de Jáuregui (2015).

⁶⁰ Edmonds (2011), within which particularly Bernabé & Jiménez San Cristóbal (2011), especially p. 101, refuting previous scholarship which had questioned the association of the leaves with Orphism; Herrero de Jáuregui (2015).

⁶¹ More recently, Horsfall (2016) provides a briefer digest of his views, particularly pp. 6 §5, 8 §8, and 9 §9(ii).

⁶² Horsfall (1991) and (1995).

⁶³ Bremmer & Horsfall (1987) and Bremmer (2009).

⁶⁴ West (1987) with bibliography, without footnotes = West (1990) with footnotes, without separate bibliography.

⁶⁵ The guarantee of exit is implicit, since the Bough is left at the threshold of Elysium (6.635-6) and not mentioned again. West (1987), p. 11 = West (1990), p. 234, makes the point that Eleusinian initiates presented their branches before re-emerging. Aeneas also, therefore, will be permitted to re-emerge.

looking ahead to the Orphic, Pythagorean, and Platonic ideas to be found in Anchises' exposition of the principle of metempsychosis (6.713-50),⁶⁶ the description '*aureus ... ramus*' (6.137) makes a subtle gesture towards Plato via Meleager of Gadara's reference to the philosopher with the expression *χρύσειον ... κλῶνα*,⁶⁷ while also alluding to the branches carried in procession by Eleusinian initiates,⁶⁸ of whom Augustus was known to be one.⁶⁹ In this context, the Bough's ability to regenerate itself (6.143-4) also foreshadows the subsequent explanation of human metempsychosis. Regarding philosophical associations, Servius also mentions the possibility that the Bough may refer to the Pythagorean metaphor of the letter *Υ* (upsilon), representing the most fundamental moral choice of life for all human beings. This idea has been explored in an article by Richard Upsher Smith, who suggests that 'the golden bough and the *Υ* shape of the infernal road are complementary symbols'.⁷⁰

Although West's interpretation is to a considerable degree convincing, it cannot be excluded that in the minds of some readers the episode may evoke an alternative or (more likely) complementary association, namely that of the *rex nemorensis*. Notwithstanding Agnes Michels' expression of surprise that 'so eminently civilized a person as Vergil' might have alluded to 'a bloody survival of primitive ritual',⁷¹ the basic facts in the text of a wooded area, the vicinity of a lake, the virtual presence of Diana in one or more of her guises, and a branch to be detached, make it easy for readers to draw parallels which Servius confirms as recognized by *publica opinio* in his time.⁷² That such a connexion could have been made much earlier, in Augustan times, also seems plausible, given that the continuing existence of this strange 'institution' is attested by Vergil's younger contemporaries, Strabo and Ovid.⁷³ This association has been pursued almost simultaneously by both Carin Green and Julia Hejduk (see further discussion below).⁷⁴ As the former points out, however, the Golden Bough may be interpreted on more than one level, the popular and recondite interpretations being not incompatible, but 'mutually enhancing'.⁷⁵

⁶⁶ Braund (1997), p. 217.

⁶⁷ Michels (1945), p. 60.

⁶⁸ Luck (1973), p. 155.

⁶⁹ Suetonius, *Divus Augustus*, 93.

⁷⁰ Servius, note to 6.136; Smith, R U (2000), p. 23.

⁷¹ Michels (1945), p. 59.

⁷² Servius, note to 6.136; Lee (1997), p. 53, suggests that Vergil would have known about the *rex nemorensis*, and was 'careful ... to make his bough, like the bough at Nemi, a certification of the bearer's qualifications'.

⁷³ Strabo, *Γεωγραφικά*, 5.3.12; Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 15.487-90, *Fasti*, 3.271-2.

⁷⁴ Green (2000); Hejduk (2001), Part 2, especially Chapter 7, pp. 133-47.

⁷⁵ Green (2000), p. 59 n. 34.

One of the articles not included in Horsfall's bibliography offers an interesting interpretation of the Golden Bough apparently not previously investigated. Adrian Pârvulescu views the Bough as a passport by dint of being a symbol of piety, but questions, albeit without entirely rejecting, the association of the Bough with branches carried by Eleusinian *μύσται*. Having noted and discarded analogies with wands wielded by Mercury, Circe, and Athena, focusing on the staff or 'rod of truce' carried by heralds,⁷⁶ he develops the idea that 'the symbolism of the Golden Bough follows ... the ritual of the suppliant placing a freshly picked olive branch before the altar of the god or the person supplicated'.⁷⁷ By way of support for his argument, he suggests that, in the encounter with Charon, the Bough, when produced at 6.406-7, establishes Aeneas as a *bona fide* suppliant seeking to enter the Underworld. He also cites by way of additional example the olive branch which Aeneas holds forth as he arrives at Pallanteum (8.116), where subsequently, in speaking to Evander, he qualifies himself as a *supplex* (8.145). One possibly relevant link which Pârvulescu omits to make, however, is with another important olive branch (*ramo felicitis olivae*: 6.230), the one which is mentioned very soon after the plucking of the Golden Bough, and which Corynaeus uses for the critical purpose of purification at the conclusion of Misenus' funeral. Pârvulescu's interpretation carries a degree of plausibility, and is not incompatible with the literary-philosophical link with Meleager and Plato (although Pârvulescu himself rejects this link). Yet, this interpretation is not wholly convincing, since it is not compatible with the Sibyl's description of the Bough, according to which Proserpina herself laid down (*instituit*: 6.143) that the Bough should be a *munus* (6.142) for herself. If the Bough stands essentially as an obligatory, honorific gift-offering, permitting the bearer to enter the Underworld (6.140: *telluris operta subire*), anyone fulfilling this duty cannot also be a suppliant.⁷⁸

Concerning the question of the Golden Bough's apparent 'reluctance' to yield to Aeneas' anxious grasp, West's view is only partially satisfactory. Simply to aver that 6.211 demonstrates 'Aeneas' boldness and strength' seems weak.⁷⁹ Horsfall offers the eminently practical and cogent suggestion, elaborating on Servius, that the reluctance reflects the natural resistance on the part of a woody plant to any attempt to remove a

⁷⁶ Pârvulescu (2005), §§ 14-15, pp. 895-6; also Clark (1979), pp. 217-8, on the grounds that Hercules was accompanied in the Underworld by Mercury; Lee (1997), p. 53, referring to Mercury's staff when he escorts the dead to the Underworld.

⁷⁷ Pârvulescu (2005), §23, p. 906; cf also p. 909.

⁷⁸ OLD2E (2012), Vol. 2, pp. 1260-1: '1. The action demanded of or requisite for a person, a function, task.' '2. A duty owed by a citizen.' '3. Something given as a duty, a tribute, offering.'

⁷⁹ West (1987), p. 4 = West (1990), p. 227. Although anachronistic, West's analogy with the 'Excalibur motif' is nevertheless useful.

part of it (*lento vimine*: 6.137).⁸⁰ Recognizing that the Bough may well have been ‘clingly’, however, Lee Fratantuono, following Servius, gives greater emphasis to Aeneas’ greedy action (*avidus*: 6.210) in snatching (*corripit ... refringit*: 6.210) rather than plucking the Bough, contrary to the Sibyl’s instruction (*carpe* 6.146), thereby reaping a transient reproach from the Bough through its resistance.⁸¹ Aeneas’ failure to obey instructions to the letter is taken further by Hejduk, and here it is tempting to entertain part of one of her theories. Her principal thesis in Part 1 of her 2001 monograph is far from convincing in general, since it seeks to attribute the misfortunes of the Trojans to the repeated failure of Aeneas, who is at this point no more than a proto-Roman, punctiliously to observe established sacrificial practices of the Augustan age (see previous discussion in Chapter 3).⁸² Nevertheless, there may be some merit in her theory here, not because Aeneas carries out the instructions of the Sibyl in the wrong order, as Hejduk asserts,⁸³ but because the situation constitutes an instance of nonfeasance rather than malfeasance. At the time when Aeneas finds and plucks the Bough, he and the Trojans are still polluted by the vicinity of the unburied corpse of Misenus. Purification does not take place until carried out, as mentioned above, by Corynaeus at 6.228-31. It is thinkable, therefore, that the brief resistance of the Golden Bough could have some connexion with this omission, reflecting a natural revulsion against a hand which is still tainted by pollution, while reluctantly recognizing that Aeneas has been called by the fates (6.147).

However *cunctantem* is interpreted, the two verbs emphasized by their positions at opposing ends of the preceding line (*corripit ... refringit*: 6.210), which describe Aeneas’ eager seizure of the Golden Bough indicate at least considerable, urgent effort, if not actual violence. Here, Hejduk discerns a more sinister parallel with the traditional means of succession to the office of priest-king exercised by the *rex nemorensis*. ‘The “priest” who slays Turnus is marked as a future victim’, so, having detached the Bough and killed Turnus, Aeneas must in turn be killed.⁸⁴ Yet while this parallel may work well for the killing of Turnus, an incumbent and indigenous Italic regent who will be succeeded by Aeneas, it is unsatisfactory in relation to the mysterious loss, presumed dead, of Aeneas, which is to occur after the end of the poem and which is to be followed

⁸⁰ Servius, note to 6.211, referring to the nature of gold: *paulatim frangitur et lentescit*; Horsfall (1991), p. 27, ‘*realismo dendrologico*’; Horsfall (1995), p. 150; Horsfall (2013), pp 158-60, note to 6.137; cf. also Williams (1972), p. 472, note to 6.211.

⁸¹ Servius, note to 6.210; Fratantuono (2007), pp. 633-4.

⁸² Hejduk (2001), Part 1, pp. 29, 38-9.

⁸³ Hejduk (2001), Part 1, pp. 39-40.

⁸⁴ Hejduk (2001), Part 2, pp. 227, 231-2.

(presumably peacefully) by the accession of Ascanius in accordance with Jupiter's prediction (1.267-71). Violence in this episode is also perceived by Richard Thomas, who notes that for Greeks and Romans the cutting of trees was 'stigmatized by society and divinity alike'.⁸⁵ Linking the Golden Bough episode to those of the bleeding roots in Thrace (3.22-9) and the mutilated wild olive at 12.766-71, he argues that these incidents symbolize the destruction which is the price of civilization in the human world.⁸⁶ As elsewhere in the *Aeneid*, Aeneas' mission is juxtaposed against the damage which it implies.

Another interpretation of the symbolism of the Golden Bough is put forward by Charles Segal, building upon Robert Brooks' view that the Bough 'transcends nature', given that 'two strange unions complement each other'.⁸⁷ Segal's argument is that the hybrid nature of the Bough, as both living organism and inert, incorruptible metal, symbolizes life and death.⁸⁸ In discussing the connotations of the metal gold,⁸⁹ however, he does not pursue possible Orphic associations nor Vergilian associations linking the *aureus ramus* not only with the *aurea tecta* of Apollo's temple complex (6.13), but also, most significantly, with the *aurea ... | ... saecula* (6.792-3), which Augustus is to (re)found, restoring the Saturnian golden age (8.324-5), which had been evident as a topic in Vergil's earlier poetry, too, indicating an era in which civil war was as yet unknown.⁹⁰ Segal also links the Bough with the death of Misenus, suggesting that his death is 'in a sense the price of the Bough'.⁹¹ Clifford Weber also argues that 'Misenus is only a stand-in for Aeneas himself' and that 'the burial of Misenus is tantamount to the burial of *Trojan* Aeneas himself'.⁹² That a surrogate death is necessary before Aeneas can enter the Underworld, however, as Servius also seems to intimate,⁹³ is difficult to accept, since the well-known precedents of Hercules and Theseus indicate otherwise.⁹⁴ Clifford also postulates a more extensive, indeed allegorical, symbolism, suggesting that the relationship between the host *ilex* and the Golden Bough symbolizes respectively the human body, which will die, and the indestructible soul. More specifically, he suggests that the Bough symbolizes Aeneas'

⁸⁵ Thomas (1988a), p. 263.

⁸⁶ Thomas (1988a), pp. 266-8, 270; cf. also Segal (1968), especially p. 79.

⁸⁷ Brooks (1953), p. 271.

⁸⁸ Segal (1965), pp. 618-34.

⁸⁹ Segal (1965), pp. 627-30.

⁹⁰ *Eclogues* 4.4-10; *Georgics* 2.536-40.

⁹¹ Segal (1965), pp. 619, 622.

⁹² My italic (see below). Weber (1995), pp. 28-9.

⁹³ Servius, note to 6.136.

⁹⁴ See also discussion in Chapter 5.3, above.

Trojan soul, which he relinquishes when he deposits the Bough at Proserpina's threshold. After a symbolic death, therefore, Aeneas undergoes the process of metempsychosis, acquiring his *Roman* soul, with which he emerges from the Underworld. Although the Trojan-Roman metamorphosis is important, it seems rather a stretch to suggest that Aeneas' soul is transformed in this way.

To summarize very briefly the essentials of this episode, the function of the Golden Bough in the narrative is as Aeneas' passport through the Underworld, reflecting and symbolizing also the juxtaposition of life and death in this section of the poem. Along with its simple function of passport to the Underworld, the episode also evokes Orphic-Pythagorean-Platonic associations in preparation for explanations to be given by Anchises. At the same time, furthermore, a less erudite association can be perceived in the brutal ritual of the *rex nemorensis*, and related to this are other sinister connotations of violence. Complementing these interpretations, a metapoetic and generic human (as opposed to metaphysical) symbolism can also be perceived, as will be argued below.

6.5 Metapoetic, and generic human symbolism of the Bough

Curiously, while various mystic and symbolic aspects of the Golden Bough episode have been discussed by scholars, the possibilities of a further complementary, but specifically metapoetic, interpretation, as well as a more generic human symbolism, seem to have been neglected and perhaps ignored altogether. As mentioned above, both Deremetz and Kofler have pointed out the temple connexions which link Aeneas with Vergil, as well as with Augustus. It seems surprising, therefore, that these associations have apparently not been adduced by scholars to support metapoetic and other symbolic human-orientated interpretations of the Golden Bough episode, especially since Deremetz, in particular, views the whole of the subsequent journey through the Underworld in metapoetic terms (see above).

Yet, the description of Aeneas finding himself in a huge forest and being led by a pair of doves to find and ultimately take possession of the Golden Bough parallels in metapoetic terms the process of poetic composition, including the real difficulties and perceived obstacles which confront authors, and which Vergil himself may well have encountered. Here, a twofold significance may be attached to the forest. In the first place, it can represent the general difficulty and perhaps initial apprehension which have to be addressed by the author of any work of substance and complexity. Secondly the

forest conveys a more specific source of anxiety, namely the daunting reputations of successful predecessors which the author wishes, and perhaps in his own terms needs, to emulate and surpass. As regards this second aspect, Stephen Hinds has suggested (as noted in Chapter 5.6) that the entry of the Trojans into the *antiquam silvam* of 6.179 announces Vergil's 'intervention in archaic Roman poetry', especially the *Annales* of Ennius.⁹⁵ In the passage under discussion, however, the competitive field is much broader, as the forest is now described as *immensam* (6.186), not just *antiquam*. What leads an author out of any initial or recurrent difficulties is, of course, inspiration, believed by some to be of divine origin, symbolized here by the two doves presumed to have been sent by Venus. Finally, succeeding in obtaining the Bough after great creative effort represents the achievement of recognition, akin to gaining the bard's laurel crown, as worn by Apollo, one of the three *vates* who feature in the early scenes of Book 6. In this scenario, the hesitation of the Bough represents no problem, given that the poetic accolade is not easily attained.

A slightly different symbolism may also be perceived at the generic human level. Aeneas the man contemplating (*aspectans*) the *silvam immensam* (6.186) is a human being temporarily at a loss in what, more than thirteen centuries later, Dante was to represent as his *selva oscura* (*Inferno*, 1.2). In Dante's Christian reworking, the wood describes the perplexity, indeed the terror *che nel pensier rinova la paura* (*Inferno*, 1.6), of one who has strayed from the *diritta via* (*Inferno*, 1.3), but in pre-Christian terms the wood must simply symbolize the state of ἀπορία in which this particular human being has been left following his conversation with the Sibyl. As in the metapoetic interpretation, the plucking of the Golden Bough by the previously bewildered man is a symbol of achievement, whether attained through strenuous effort or through violence. In any event, possession of the Golden Bough enables the holder to proceed to greater things.⁹⁶ Here, the appearance of the pair of doves has no special significance, but can be seen as the line of thought or the resolve within an individual or any significant external assistance (possibly unexpected) which permits the individual's quest to be carried through to completion. Again, the hesitation of the Bough is wholly understandable in such an interpretation.

Amongst scholarly contributions, only Owen Lee's chapter on the Bough gets close to articulating symbolism relating to the human condition in general and human

⁹⁵ Hinds (1998), p. 13.

⁹⁶ Segal (1965), pp. 627-8, notes: 'Throughout Pindar gold is associated with achievement approaching divine brilliance', but does not relate this association to human endeavour in general.

striving after achievement at all levels. In Lee's interpretation, the whole of Aeneas' trajectory through the *Aeneid* is to be seen as a quest in pursuit of self-discovery. Yet, at the end of the poem the degree of self-knowledge which Aeneas may or may not have gained is not at all clear, even though he will achieve the objective required by his destiny and will ultimately be rewarded with apotheosis. Moreover, despite adoption of a Christian-Jungian psychological perspective, Lee does not develop his ideas on the heroic quest more widely to apply, potentially at any rate, to the struggle which all human beings experience to a greater or lesser degree in going through life.⁹⁷

6.6 Sacrifices to the chthonic gods

Following the discovery of the Golden Bough, the next scene describes the funeral of Misenus, which has been discussed in Chapter 5. With scarcely a pause the text then continues rapidly into the last 26 lines of the Transitional Section prior to the *κατάβασις*, with a description of sacrifices to the chthonic gods (6.236-61) which had been prescribed earlier by the Sibyl (6.153). Time and location are swiftly changed, for the sacrifices take place at night (*nocturnas ... aras*: 6.252; *primi sub limina solis et ortus*: 6.255)⁹⁸ and must be understood to be carried out not at the same location as Misenus' funeral on the shore, but close to the entry to the Underworld by Lake Avernus. So far as the present chapter is concerned, however, the most important action carried out during the ceremony for Misenus occurs when Corynaeus sprinkles the assembled body of Trojans with water (6.229-31). This action purifies all present (*lustravitque viros*: 6.231), thereby removing the pollution to which the Sibyl had alerted Aeneas at 6.149-50. Consequently, having been purified, Aeneas is now able, with the Sibyl, to undertake the final sacrifices required for the chthonic gods and then to embark on his journey through the Underworld. As noted in Chapter 3.1 and Table 4, the description of the sacrifices carried out at this juncture is one of the fuller accounts of such ritual in the *Aeneid*, and the only one performed for the chthonic gods. Numerous different beasts are slaughtered to propitiate not only the facilitating goddess, Hecate, but also Nox and Terra, and the monarchs of the Underworld, Dis and Proserpina. Also, according to Servius, the form of ritual carried out is a holocaust sacrifice, a less common type of sacrifice in which the victims are completely

⁹⁷ Lee (1997), Chapter 3, 'The Golden Bough', pp. 41-69.

⁹⁸ Mynors (1969), p. 235, has *limina*. Norden (1927), p. 204, followed by Austin (1977), p. 113 (with a useful explanation and suggested translation), and Horsfall (2013), p. 224, all have *limina*, noting in addition to manuscript authority the intertext with *sub limina solis* in Catullus 64.271. Other commentaries have *lumina*.

incinerated.⁹⁹ Such a sacrifice, which may have been normal practice for the chthonic gods, clearly cannot be followed by a feast, and there is no intimation of a feast here.¹⁰⁰

Hejduk has suggested that these sacrifices constitute another example of Aeneas' procedural errors which contribute to his misfortunes, since the Romans believed that incorrect practice could not appease the gods. According to this view, Aeneas does not conform here with the instructions previously given by the Sibyl (6.153), which Hejduk interprets as meaning that black sheep should have been sacrificed before Misenus' funeral, which in turn should have preceded the retrieval of the Golden Bough.¹⁰¹ In fact, Aeneas performs these actions in precisely the reverse order. Moreover, instead of sacrificing black sheep (*nigras pecudes*: 6.153), he sacrifices only one black lamb (*atri velleris agnam*: 6.249), as well as a sterile cow. Yet, if the sequence of fulfilment or if the precise choice of sacrificial victim had been critical, it seems unlikely that the Sibyl, who had shown herself to be stern and commanding when she first met Aeneas, would have allowed him to proceed without correction. This is particularly true in this last scene, where, even if she is not the officiating *sacerdos* of 6.244,¹⁰² she is certainly present when, using words which recall a ritual formula deemed to be Orphic (*procul o, procul este, profani*: 6.258), she bids the profane to withdraw at the end of the scene (*conclamat vates*: 6.259).¹⁰³

6.7 Conclusion

Although it has been necessary, for considerations of length, to discuss in a separate chapter the two scenes relating to Misenus, the five scenes concluding the Transitional Section need to be viewed together. Nested, as they are, in a symmetrical structure, these scenes constitute a complex, integrated 'final approach' to the Underworld, culminating in the multiple sacrifices for the chthonic gods. A sharp break separates these scenes from the immediately preceding ekphrasis. At that point, the

⁹⁹ Servius on 6.253 indicates that this is a holocaust sacrifice; Horsfall (2013), p. 223, note to 6.253, however, questions whether this is the case, stating that such sacrifices were not common in Rome.

¹⁰⁰ Hubert & Mauss (1899/1964), p. 38 n. 238, indicate that sacrifice involving destruction of the body was often performed for the infernal deities.

¹⁰¹ Hejduk (2001), pp. 39-41; she also suggests (p. 41) the possibility that Aeneas may have sacrificed the wrong animal because of the ambiguity of *pecudes*.

¹⁰² Horsfall (2013), p. 219, note to 6.244, raises the possibility that the *sacerdos* here could be an anonymous Trojan priest, possibly even Corynaeus; other commentators, mostly through silence, evidently assume that the celebrant is the Sibyl, *Phoebe Triviaeque sacerdos* (6.35); Austin (1977), p. 111, explicitly identifies the Sibyl as the *sacerdos*.

¹⁰³ Bernabé (2004), Pars II, Fasc. 1, p. 2, Frr. 1a, 1b: θύρας δ' ἐπίθεσθε, βέβηλοι. Cf. also: Plato, Συμπόσιον, 218.b. Kouremenos, *et al.* (2006), p. 75 (Col. VII, ll. 9-10); Bremmer (2009), pp. 185-6; Graf (2011), pp. 63-4; Horsfall (2013), p. 227, note to 6.258-61.

Trojans had been gazing at a representation of the remote past, so their attention is brought back emphatically to the fictitious present and they are physically led away from the temple doors.

As the Trojans move into the Sibyl's cavern, the virtual presence of Apollo goes with them. Preponderance of vatic vocabulary in the text then creates an appropriate atmosphere for the mystic, oracular utterings of the Sibyl, as well as drawing attention to the rôle of *vates*, inviting readers to recognize the additional presence of a third *vates*, the poet, as well as the vatic god and the vatic priestess. Hence the possibility arises of a metapoetic interpretation both here and later in this series of scenes. Such an interpretation is facilitated by Aeneas' vows to Apollo and the Sibyl which bring to mind not only the temple of Apollo Palatinus, vowed and subsequently consecrated by Augustus only a few years before the time when Vergil was writing the *Aeneid*, but also the earlier temple of Hercules of the Muses with its literary associations, and more importantly Vergil's own metapoetic temple, the *Aeneid* itself, promised at the beginning of *Georgics* 3. Aeneas, Augustus, and Vergil are therefore closely associated through the physical and metaphorical temples which each has vowed. At the same time, allusion to the vows made by Octavian also direct attention towards the Augustan present. Associating Aeneas and Augustus through the latter's fulfilment of an essentially identical vow brings into focus not only the supposed genealogical relationship, but also the rôles of both of them as founder and refounder of the Roman people, thereby preparing the reader for the parade of heroes which is to follow at the end of Aeneas' visit to the Underworld.

Apollo's twin sister is also in evidence at this stage, since the Sibyl serves as the priestess of both deities. Moreover, Diana's chthonic manifestation is essential for the plot, since Hecate may be seen as Aeneas' divine sponsor for his entry to the Underworld. Hence, her presence is felt when the earth trembles (6.256) and she is included in the final sacrifices before Aeneas and the Sibyl embark upon their journey. Inevitably, as they prepare to visit the realm of the dead, the theme of death makes itself felt. Except indirectly, through the commemoration of Anchises, death had been almost completely absent in Book 5, but comes back to the fore, initially through the loss of Palinurus, presumed dead, at the end of the book, and then through the events portrayed in the ekphrasis at the beginning of Book 6. Palinurus, however, is at that point only lost, presumed dead, while the death of Icarus is unnarrated and happened in the remote past. Early in Book 6, however, after the Sibyl's prediction, the death of Misenus and

the discovery of his body feature explicitly in the narrative. Palinurus and Misenus, in particular, highlight the randomness of accidental death (whether or not a god is said to be responsible). Furthermore, Misenus may possibly (although doubtfully) be a surrogate, needed before Aeneas is permitted to enter the Underworld. In any event, his funeral provides the opportunity for an elaborate description of religious ceremonial, including the essential purification from the pollution created by his death in the first place. Religious ritual is also emphasized in the sacrifices to the chthonic gods just after the completion of Misenus' funeral.

Mysticism is introduced in these scenes through the activities of the Sibyl, her trance and predictions, the preconditions which she establishes for Aeneas' visit to see his father, and the sacrifices to the chthonic gods over which she presides. The most important mystic and symbolic episode, however, occurs in the central scene of the five. Framed by Misenus' death and funeral,¹⁰⁴ the discovery of the Golden Bough is critical for Aeneas' entry to the Underworld, but also generates complementary overtones for the less erudite as well as for the learned. Association of the Bough with the Orphic and Eleusinian mystery cults and with Pythagorean and Platonic eschatology foreshadows Anchises' exposition of human metempsychosis. More sinister associations, however, link the Bough with the primitive and barbaric tradition of the *rex nemorensis*. Metapoetic and symbolic interpretations also reveal connexions with the poet himself and more generically with the human condition.

Accompanying this sombre and disquieting atmosphere of death, mysticism, and religious ritual, which runs throughout, may also be hints of the 'other voices' which have been found in Vergil. The possible ambiguity of *vates* with a rather negative legacy significance may generate some worry on the part of more sensitive readers. Similarly, those who perceive violence in the retrieval of the Golden Bough see sinister parallels elsewhere which may point to the violence implicit in the pursuit of the glory of empire which will be revealed by Anchises.

Overall, therefore, the five scenes discussed here can be interpreted on more than one plane and present a complex and multi-tiered prelude to the Underworld. As Segal points out in relation to the Golden Bough, it would be a mistake 'to seek a single meaning for so profound and complex a symbol'.¹⁰⁵ In addition to the narrative which has now been brought to the brink of the climax of the first half of the poem, however,

¹⁰⁴ Segal (1965), p. 621.

¹⁰⁵ Segal (1965), p. 624; similarly: Green (2000), p. 59 n. 34.

the reader may perceive contemporary (to Vergil) literary, and personal (also to Vergil) references, especially through an evidently close metapoetic relationship with the beginning of Book 3 of the *Georgics*. Above all, the last five scenes of the Transitional Section provide a remarkable poetic and quasi-dramatic preparation for the descent to the Underworld, building an appropriate atmosphere attended especially by death rites and other religious and mystic ritual. At the end of these five scenes, Aeneas will pass from his own world, in which mortality is all too evident, into the world of the dead themselves. Accordingly, duly purified, hero and poet, possessed respectively of the physical and metapoetic Golden Bough, set out jointly for the climax of the first half of the poem.

7. Conclusion: transition in context

As argued in my Introduction, a strong case exists for considering as a single, compound unit the section of the narrative of the *Aeneid* which has been referred to throughout this thesis as the 'Transitional Section' (Chap. 1.0, 1.3). Despite the considerable amount of scholarly attention which has been lavished on a number of the individual component scenes, however, especially on the episodes of Palinurus, the Daedalus ekphrasis, and the Golden Bough, no analysis which treats the Transitional Section as a coherent entity has been found in the literature.

Comprising the 529 lines which run from the end of the games commemorating the first anniversary of Anchises' death to the beginning of the descent into the Underworld by Aeneas and the Sibyl (5.604-6.261), the Transitional Section is distinguished by two structural features which are unique within the *Aeneid*. Firstly, the tight continuity, akin to an enjambment, across consecutive books, such as occurs between Books 5 and 6 without a pause, is not found elsewhere within the poem (Chap. 1.0, 1.3, and Table 1). Secondly, the concatenation of twelve individual scenes which together make up the Transitional Section exhibits a complexity of structure which also does not occur in any other transition between two important and well-known extended narrative sections within the poem. If a reason for this complexity were to be sought, then it would seem to lie in the radically different nature and content of the narratives relating the games and the Underworld, the former portraying the Trojan men relaxing collectively, the latter being personal to Aeneas, as well as didactic and philosophical in character. It would be difficult to envisage these two narrative sections following on immediately one from the other. This concluding chapter, therefore, looks at the functions fulfilled by the Transitional Section, at how the modulation of mood and content is effected, and at the contribution to the poem as a whole.

Each of the preceding five chapters has discussed aspects of one or more of the twelve scenes of the Transitional Section. If, therefore, those five chapters may be considered as having 'sliced up' the text from a 'vertical' perspective, then in this concluding chapter I propose to adopt a 'horizontal' approach. Firstly, I shall seek to place the entire Transitional Section into the thematic context of the poem as a whole, identifying important threads which occur in more than one place in the twelve

individual scenes, and which recall readers' attention to events from earlier in the poem and/or presage events which are to come later. In order to do so, I intend initially to examine the principal functions fulfilled by the Transitional Section in effecting a narrative bridge between the games and the Underworld. These functions can be characterized in the two words 'recapitulation' and 'preparation', the former primarily for the benefit of both first-time readers and re-readers,¹ the latter for the benefit not only of (re-)readers, but also of Aeneas and his followers in anticipation of Aeneas' imminent descent into the realm of the dead. Secondly, I shall look at various narrative techniques and poetic devices which Vergil adopts in fulfilment of these functions. In conclusion I pick out and summarize a number of features which I believe stand out particularly in the Transitional Section, without, however, intending to detract in any way from other facets of Vergil's poetic presentation within the epic framework.

7.1 Recapitulation

One of the most striking elements of the Transitional Section from its very first scene is the return to centre stage of Olympian and other gods, bringing back into the narrative one of the traditional characteristic elements of epic, while serving also to remind readers of the divinely-ordained nature of Aeneas' mission, especially through the difficulties associated with it. Except for the intervention by the minor god Portunus with a team of Nereids in answer to Cloanthus' prayer (Chap. 2.0), no active rôle is attributed to gods in the commemorative games. Moreover, before that the previous intervention of a god had been that of Mercury, following instructions from Jupiter, during the Trojans' sojourn at Carthage (Chap. 2.0). Yet in the space of the twelve scenes of the Transitional Section, the reader encounters no fewer than six of the Olympian gods (Juno, Jupiter [Chap. 2.3], Venus and Neptune [Chaps. 2.6, 3.4], Apollo and his tripartite twin sister Diana-Trivia-Hecate [Chap. 6.0]), each of whom is in some way instrumental in the resumption of the principal action of the poem following the extended pause occasioned by the time spent firstly at Carthage and subsequently at Drepanum. Lesser gods are also portrayed as exercising a direct influence on the action. Iris carries out the instructions of Juno (Chap. 2.3), and by implication Somnus may perhaps fulfil unnarrated orders issued by Neptune (Chap. 3.4), while Triton is said to punish Misenus (Chap. 5.3). Anchises, recently deified (as it would seem) also makes

¹ Chapter 1.1 discusses readers and audiences inside and outside the text, with particular reference to the contributions of Charles Martindale, Don Fowler and Lowell Edmunds; see also Chapter 4.1 relating to who 'sees' what in relation to the temple doors at Cumae.

an appearance in the first half of the Transitional Section (Chap. 2.4). Later, at the end of the Section, the principal chthonic gods, Dis (by name) and Proserpina (indicated by periphrasis), are accorded sacrifices before Aeneas and the Sibyl enter their kingdom (Chap. 6.6). This return to prominence of divine and supernatural influences not only looks back to the beginning of the poem, but also foreshadows later episodes in which various gods are portrayed as influencing the action of the poem. In addition to later episodes involving Olympians, such as Venus, Vulcan, Apollo, Juno and ultimately Jupiter, readers will also encounter lesser immortals who influence the action, such as Allecto, Tiberinus, Juturna, Faunus, and the unnamed Dira.

In the material crisis occasioned when the women set fire to the fleet, thereby setting in motion the only obstacle to threaten Aeneas' mission from within the Trojan community, readers are also reminded of two important aspects of characterization. First of all, the immediate reaction of Ascanius as he arrives first on the scene and rebukes the women shows him to possess instinctive leadership qualities over and above the technical performance skills learnt under the auspices of his guardian and companion Epytides and demonstrated shortly before in the equestrian display of the *lusus Troiae* (Chap. 2.3). Here, also, the importance of father-son relationships and, in political terms, the leadership succession as decreed by Jupiter in Book 1, are made manifest, both of which are highlighted again shortly afterwards when the apparition of Anchises instructs his son to visit him in the Underworld (Chap. 2.4). Secondly, the shock of the material crisis provokes a serious psychological crisis in Aeneas, reminding readers of the extreme duress under which he has to labour. Readers also become aware that, as on previous occasions when Aeneas' resolve has seemed to waver (such as when shipwrecked, or during the months at Carthage), he overcomes the latest crisis and emerges as a stronger character and with greater stature, whether his restored confidence is interpreted as deriving from his own internal resources or from external intervention by divine and supernatural agencies.

While the nefarious machinations of Juno serve to recall her implacable opposition to Aeneas and the obstacles she has placed in his path, her actions also draw attention to the mission he is ultimately destined to fulfil, which is brought back into the foreground even more prominently through the foundation of Acesta (Chap. 2.5). Ironically, it is the damage to the fleet perpetrated at the behest of Juno which results indirectly in the strengthening of Aeneas' resolve after his brief but serious crisis, and brings simultaneously a solution to the problem which, although not explicitly

mentioned, is posed by the reduction of the number of ships. In the only scene of *ktisis* in the poem, therefore, by ploughing the boundaries in accordance with Roman practice and in facilitating the establishment by Acestes of a forum and a senate, Aeneas is seen to be enacting proleptically and by proxy the culmination of his mission. By means of this episode, Vergil is able to foreshadow actions which could not otherwise be depicted, since the foundation of Lavinium is destined to take place after the defeat of Turnus, so beyond the end of the poem, and the foundations of Alba Longa and ultimately Rome are to follow much later still. At the same time, in terms of characterization, readers are able to see the continuation of the process of metamorphosis in Aeneas from Trojan towards proto-Roman leader once his final and most dangerous crisis of confidence has been overcome.

Human suffering and death are also brought back into full view, having been absent throughout the games, despite veiled hints of a sinister nature, such as the proxy death of the bull won by Entellus (Chap. 5.5) and the rather darkly comic incident in which the non-fatal treatment of Menoetes by Gyas (Chap. 3.3) foreshadows Palinurus' similar, but ultimately fatal misfortune. After the relatively quiet interlude in which the Trojan men are shown enjoying themselves, readers are given a sharp reminder of the difficulties and harshness of the seven years or more of wandering since the fall of Troy. Moreover, this reminder is particularly poignant since it is focalized and vocalized through the female perspective.² As the *lusus Troiae* reaches its climax, the simmering discontent of the long-suffering women, who are excluded from the spectacle, is described in most moving terms (Chap. 2.3). Not long afterwards, the presumed death of the highly experienced steersman Palinurus, draws attention to the risk of accident associated with sea-travel even in fair weather (Chap. 3), while the death of Icarus is alluded to in the ekphrasis (Chap. 4.3), and that of Misenus, whether a result of hubris or through misadventure or accident, is both unexpected and arbitrary (Chaps. 5.1, 5.3). Although when viewed within the wider context of Aeneas' mission these individual losses may be considered to be minor incidents affecting secondary characters, the shadow of death is cast over the rest of the Transitional Section. Whether or not Misenus is seen as suffering death as proxy for Aeneas (Chap. 5.7), the pall hanging over the Trojans at this point is entirely appropriate, since Aeneas and the Sibyl are shortly to enter the realm of the dead. Moreover, the account of Misenus' funeral is

² Focalization is discussed in Chapter 1.0.

immediately followed by the sacrifices for the chthonic gods prior to the κατάβασις (Chap. 6.6).

7.2 Preparation

While Aeneas' character and piety are rehabilitated to a considerable extent through his paternalistic conduct during the first two-thirds of Book 5, following the flight from Carthage, he is still not yet fully prepared for the experience he is to undergo in the latter part of Book 6. When the fleet is set on fire, his recently restored piety is rewarded by Jupiter himself, and the losses are restricted to four out of his nineteen ships. Nevertheless, his resolve wavers but is resuscitated as a result of both human and supernatural reassurance (Chap. 2.4). With renewed confidence, therefore, he is prepared for his next major action, which shows him behaving in the manner of the founder of a new Roman city in marking out the boundaries of Acesta, as already mentioned above (Chap. 2.5).

Further preparation is provided by the series of religious acts which extend through the Transitional Section and which testify to Aeneas' increasing piety. Although the commemorative games are in themselves a religious act (Chap. 2.0), after the initial prayers and sacrifices have been made, no further religious ritual takes place. Ritual returns in the Transitional Section, progressively building up an atmosphere of piety and mysticism. As soon as Aeneas sees the fleet burning, he prays to Jupiter (Chap. 2.4). Subsequently, he venerates the Lares of Troy and Vesta with meal and incense, establishes a shrine to Venus of Idalium, institutes nine days of religious celebration to mark the foundation of Acesta, and makes further sacrifices prior to departing from Drepanum (Chap. 2.5). Upon meeting the Sibyl, Aeneas prays to Apollo and vows a temple to him, while also promising the Sibyl that her oracles will be preserved in a dedicated sanctuary (Chap. 6.3). At this point, as will be discussed further below, the complex associations of the designation *vates*, as prophet and/or bard, take on a particular importance. Although not especially detailed, the Sibyl's prophecy not only links back to previous prophecy by others such as Creusa, the harpy Celaeno, and Helenus, but prepares Aeneas and readers for the more detailed predictions which are to be heard in the Underworld. Subsequently, Aeneas conducts the rites for the burial of Misenus (Chap. 5.6), which are essential in order to achieve purification from the pollution associated with Misenus' dead body before Aeneas and the Sibyl can enter the Underworld. Finally, he presides with the Sibyl over sacrifices to propitiate the

gods of the Underworld and thereby to complete his preparation for entry into their kingdom (Chap. 6.6). In the atmosphere of dutiful piety created by all these activities, readers may also discern elements reminiscent of the Eleusinian and Orphic mystery cults, which through their concern with the after-life also point towards the Pythagorean and Platonic philosophy of metempsychosis, (mediated in part through Cicero), which Anchises will expound in the latter part of Book 6. Such elements are particularly noticeable in the interactions with the Sibyl (Chap. 6.2) and in the symbolic overtones in the episode of the Golden Bough (Chap. 6.4).

Depictions of sacrifice in the *Aeneid* are numerous (Chap. 3.1: Table 3), so those in the Transitional Section resonate with others, especially in Books 3 and 8. Amongst the multiple instances of suffering, death, and religious and mystic ritual in the latter part of Book 5 and in the first third of Book 6, however, the fate of Palinurus stands out as unusual. Given the immediate and wider contexts, it may not be especially surprising that his loss overboard and presumed death have been designated as sacrifice by a very large number of scholars and also, by some, as scapegoat (Chap. 3.0). Yet if indeed Palinurus were a sacrificial victim or a scapegoat, his loss would be not so much unusual as unique. Given that on a literal reading it is a god who executes the critical act which leads ultimately, after a long delay, to the death of this unwilling victim in an entirely different location, and given also the absence of priest and other participants, this incident has none of the principal distinguishing characteristics of ancient Greek or Roman sacrifice (Chap. 3.1: Table 4). Servius does not refer to the incident as sacrifice, and it seems unlikely that an Augustan reader would have recognized it as such. Nor does Palinurus as sacrifice fit well with definitions of sacrificial procedure put forward around the turn of the nineteenth-twentieth centuries by Hubert and Mauss, and by Holstein, and largely accepted by more recent scholars such as Burkert, Girard, and Vernant, who have sought to understand from an anthropological or theological perspective the origins and/or underlying meaning of such sacrificial procedure, as well as, sometimes, of practices relating to scapegoats (Chap. 3.2). Similarly, from a modern psychological perspective, no match can be found with the concepts of sacrifice or scapegoat developed by Freud and Jung (Chap. 3.2). Even recognizing the more extended semantic field of the word 'sacrifice' which has developed in modern popular and journalistic usage, it is not easy to accept this designation, except possibly in the extremely loose sense of an arbitrary tragedy which strikes down an individual associated with a collective mission (Chap. 3.5). Nevertheless, as the first human casualty to be narrated since the suicide of Dido at the end of Book 4, the presumed

death of Palinurus is important as a significant ‘milestone’ underlining how unexpected and arbitrary accidents represent a constant threat to human life even under apparently safe conditions. Although no precedent seems to require a proxy death before Aeneas is allowed to enter and return from the Underworld, human mortality is powerfully evoked as the poem proceeds towards the visit to the Underworld. Following the Palinurus episode, therefore, and together with the death of and funeral rites for Misenus shortly thereafter, both readers and the newly purified Aeneas are prepared psychologically for the journey into the Underworld.

7.3 Narrative and poetic technique

Scenes in the Transitional Section exhibit considerable variety in the forms of expression employed. Some scenes are narrated by the poet quite straightforwardly, either without direct speech, as in the case of the foundation of Acesta (Chap. 2.5) or with minimal speech as in the discovery of the Golden Bough (Chap. 6.4), where there is only a short monologue by way of prayer, which discloses Aeneas’ thoughts to the reader, and a brief apostrophe to the pair of doves and Venus. On the other hand, several of the scenes display characteristics of drama, as in the burning of the boats (Chap. 2.3), the conversation between Venus and Neptune (Chap. 2.6), and in Aeneas’ initial interaction with the Sibyl (Chap. 6.2). Indeed, the Transitional Section as a whole is marked by almost double the proportion of direct speech as is to be found in the account of the games in the first two-thirds of Book 5 (Chap. 2.8). In an extended and varied epic narrative, however, such individual quasi-dramatic scenes do not knit into a single integrated entity as in the theatrical genres of tragedy and comedy.³ Particular attention is therefore drawn to the significance of the words and tone in such scenes, especially since the two speeches uttered by Aeneas in the presence of the Sibyl constitute a notable exception to what Feeney, followed by Braund, has referred to as the general ‘taciturnity’ of Aeneas in most parts of the poem (Chap. 1.5, 6.2). Aeneas’ usual terse manner of issuing orders or exhorting his comrades is not appropriate when faced with the need to obtain co-operation from the Sibyl in order to be able to make the journey into the Underworld. In consequence, Aeneas has to adopt the uncharacteristic rôle of suppliant and use a more diplomatic eloquence to achieve his end. Elsewhere, this persuasive style on the part of Aeneas is evident only in his overtures to Evander. Hence, dramatic elements in a number of the scenes, contrasting strongly with the

³ Dramatic elements in the *Aeneid* are discussed in Chapter 1.0.

relatively straightforward narrative of the games, are a lively and effective method of moving the action forward, showing character, and communicating varying perspectives by means of the interaction of different individuals through direct speech in a range of situations and locations. Mostly, the tone of the Transitional Section is serious and solemn, as in Aeneas' crisis (Chaps. 2.3, 2.4), or the burial of Misenus (Chap. 5.6), or the sacrifices to the chthonic gods (Chap. 6.6), yet much more rarely there are also lighter, almost humorous moments, as when Aeneas and Acestes are 'wrong-footed' over the death of one of their comrades referred to by the Sibyl (Chap. 5.1) or when the poet distances himself from the myth-like version which he relates of Misenus' death (Chap. 5.3).

Structurally, the Transitional Section offers some interesting features. As already mentioned, the use of a concatenation of twelve relatively short and brisk scenes to effect a change from one mood to a radically different mood is unique within the *Aeneid* (Chap. 1.3, Tables 1 and 2). Throughout the Transitional Section, a persistent religious backdrop, which may be considered as part of the infrastructure, is provided through divine interventions combined with sacrificial and funeral rites, and their mystic connotations. A degree of symmetrical structure also exists, pivoting about the Daedalus ekphrasis (Chap. 4), which at roughly the mid-point of the Transitional Section separates those scenes which are predominantly backward-looking prior to the arrival in Latium from those which lay preparations for the κατάβασις. Even more marked is the symmetry with which the episode of the Golden Bough is 'nested' as the middle scene of five, enclosed by two scenes relating to the death and funeral of Misenus, which in turn are enclosed by two scenes with the Sibyl (Chap. 6.1). Symmetry can also be perceived extending forwards and backwards beyond the Transitional Section. Two examples are noteworthy. Firstly, the Daedalus ekphrasis with its multiple time-bands is the central one of the three major ekphraseis in the *Aeneid*, occupying a position in the text some time after the backward-looking images described as being in the temple of Juno at Carthage in Book 1, but well before the forward-looking images on the shield forged by Vulcan for Aeneas in Book 8 (Chap. 4.2). Secondly, the Venus-Neptune conversation similarly fits within a structural pattern of dialogues between gods which take place between Venus and Jupiter in Book 1, and between Jupiter and Juno Book 12 (Chap. 2.6).

Although not perhaps exactly a symmetrical feature, a further infrastructural pattern may be perceived in the series of episodes concerning the building of cities

which runs through the poem reflecting and reinforcing Aeneas' most important objective (Chap. 2.5). Paradoxically, the first such episode sees Aeneas assisting in the construction of the city which many centuries later was repeatedly designated by Cato the Censor as *delenda*, and was finally destroyed in 146 BCE. So far as Trojan cities are concerned, however, after the sack of Troy there is a progression throughout the poem from the two failed cities in Thrace and in Crete, through the backward-looking Buthrotum, to the successful Acesta and pre-Roman Pallanteum, all of which point forwards to a series of later foundations, Lavinium, Alba Longa, and Rome, which cannot be narrated since they are to take place beyond the end of the poem. If these cities stand for a constructive aspect of Roman history, several non-Trojan cities point up the destructive side of 'civilization'. Starting once again with Troy and Carthage, cities of non-Trojan foundation include Ardea, Privernum, Tyre, and Calydon, each one of which is described in the poem as [*urbs*] *antiqua*, suggesting, according to Reed, that from an Augustan perspective they are all 'has-beens', having been conquered or destroyed during the course of Roman imperial expansion, or even earlier. At the same time, their fate also suggests that all cities are likely eventually to be subject to decline and fall, an adumbration foreshadowing Anchises' listing of eight Italian cities which, as Feeney has pointed out, have been eclipsed by the development of the metropolis of Rome. Within the Transitional Section, therefore, while Acesta represents the 'progressive' element of history (Chap. 2.5), the less fortunate cities are represented by Cnossus, which although not described as *antiqua* is rooted in mythological time (Chap. 4.3), and by Augustan times had become the site of a Roman *colonia*.

Cultural changes affecting attitudes to the gods in epic during the period of more than half a millennium since Homer may be seen as reflected to a considerable degree in Vergil's composition. Commentators on earlier epic had criticized the representation of gods as making them too pro-active on the human stage, as well as unduly fractious and immoral (Chap. 2.1). In the Transitional Section, however, a degree of ambivalence is evident in the way in which the gods are portrayed. On one level, therefore, it is possible to take the gods at face value, as characters in their own right who influence and drive the action of the epic. Yet, it is also possible in some instances to identify a degree of ambiguity concerning the rôle allegedly played by the gods, interpreting their supposed interventions in the affairs of mortals as metaphors for natural phenomena or human psychological factors, as may be seen in the boat-burning episode (Chap. 2.3), or the lack of clarity as to whether or not Palinurus simply fell asleep on duty (Chap. 2.7), or the doubt cast by the poet himself on the rôle supposed to have been played by Triton

in the death of Misenus (Chap. 5.3). As a consequence, no single theory which has been advanced concerning Vergil's depiction of the immortals, whether by Coleman, Williams, Lyne, or Feeney, is entirely satisfactory in respect of the Transitional Section (Chap. 2.2). In most passages where one theory may at first seem the more appropriate, Vergil's text is simultaneously susceptible of a different interpretation, leaving readers with a degree of uncertainty which they may resolve for themselves. Overall, the gods as one of the principal traditional attributes of epic are seen to be treated with subtle ambiguity and intimations of scepticism, offering the reader the possibility of multiple interpretations. In consequence, a selective amalgam of all four views concerning the rôle of the gods enriches the reading experience of the Transitional Section. Treatment of the gods which is at variance with earlier epic also has the effect of suggesting that Vergil was seeking to demonstrate his superiority through differentiation, as will be seen below in relation to intertextuality.

Although progress towards the κατάβασις in the relatively short scenes at the end of Book 5 is fairly quick, at roughly the mid-point of the Transitional Section, as already indicated, the narrative is placed on pause by means of a brief, but complex ekphrasis (Chap. 4). Brief it is indeed (nineteen and a half lines), and the action soon resumes its course following the Sibyl's sharp interruption, just as the Trojans (and readers) are beginning to become deeply absorbed in the decoration on the temple doors attributed to Daedalus. Because of its very brevity, the ekphrasis here is, in its treatment of time, very concentrated, and hence even more complex than the other two major ekphraseis in the *Aeneid*. Indeed, in this passage, Vergil manipulates chronology in such a way that the scenes depicted represent symbolically three different time-bands, intertwining archaic mythological elements with the fictitious present of the poem and with the Augustan 'future', corresponding to the time when Vergil was writing. Furthermore, at the climactic point of the ekphrasis, the poet intrudes upon the descriptive text with an apostrophe to Icarus, one which draws particular attention not just to the personal tragedy which Daedalus fails to portray on the temple doors, but more particularly to the limits of the sculptor's skill occasioned by the intensity of his emotions.

While the Daedalus ekphrasis is the most complex manipulation of chronological strands in the Transitional Section, the symbolic representation through fictitious time of the poet's contemporary historical time, beneath which political actuality is often to be suspected, also occurs elsewhere, as in the identification of Aeneas with Augustus in

the *ktisis* episode and in Aeneas' prayer and sacrifices to Eryx and to the Tempests when the Trojans are about to leave Drepanum (Chap. 3.1), as well as in the vow of a temple to Apollo with its allusion to the Augustan architectural programme (Chap. 6.3). These lightly veiled references to Augustus link back to the explicit mention of a Caesar (whether Julius or Octavian-Augustus) in Jupiter's promise to Venus in Book 1, and anticipate unambiguous mentions of Augustus both in Anchises' explanatory speech concerning the parade of heroes in Book 6 (where Julius is also probably featured), and on the shield presented to Aeneas in Book 8. Elsewhere, symbolic meaning underlying Misenus' funeral points on the fictitious level to a commemorative act for all who perished neither in their original nor in their promised *patria* between Troy and Latium, while also standing in the contemporary historical time of Vergil for the funeral of Marcellus (Chap. 5). Similarly, the Palinurus episode may represent the loss of a good many sailors off Capo Palinuro in 36 BCE during the war against Sextus Pompeius.

In addition to the apostrophe to Icarus, a voice marked as that of the poet is heard several more times in the course of the Transitional Section. Sometimes, the intervention serves to indicate a degree of scepticism over the version of an incident reported, as with 'signpost' formulae such as *fertur* or *si credere dignum est*. On other occasions, by means of what have been dubbed Vergil's 'other voices', the poet's feeling for some of his characters in their misfortunes is evident. In some places, as with the apostrophe to Icarus, the voice is explicit, indicating sympathy with the victims of fatal accidents, such as in the further apostrophes to Palinurus (Chap. 2.7) and Misenus (Chap. 5.6). Elsewhere, however, the poet's sympathy is implicit, as in the Trojan women's lamentations concerning the hardships they have had to endure (Chap. 2.3). Once again, these expressions of sympathy resonate with others throughout the poem, such as those in the accounts of the deaths of Orontes in Book 1 (and Book 6) and of numerous Trojans during the fall of their city, especially Priam, in Book 2, as well as, notably, the deaths of Pallas and Lausus in Book 10 and of Camilla in Book 11. Through his sensitive treatment of such episodes, Vergil demonstrates an understanding both of the arbitrary nature of human suffering in general, and more specifically of suffering as 'collateral damage' of the military force involved in building an empire and maintaining an imposed peace.

7.4 Intertextuality, and metapoetic and self-referential significance

An authorial voice also manifests itself in other ways, indicating concern with the poet's own personal place in the poetic universe. Vergil's intertextual engagement with earlier poets, notably, in the Transitional Section, Homer, Apollonius Rhodius, Ennius, and Catullus, with a passing nod towards Callimachus, testifies to a complex mixture of respect and rivalry, reflecting a competitive element in Roman poetic culture.⁴ Indeed, unmistakeable allusions, albeit subtly varied, to Vergil's most eminent predecessors might be read as suggesting that he is at the same time seeking to surpass their poetic achievements. The Palinurus and Misenus episodes have obvious parallels with Homeric characters, such as Odysseus' oarsman Elpenor and Menelaus' steersman Phrontis, while Palinurus also recalls Apollonius Rhodius' character Tiphys. Similarly, Misenus' funeral is modelled upon the Homeric description of the funeral of Patroclus. In the Daedalus ekphrasis, there is clear reference in words and metre to Catullus' epyllion relating the story of Theseus and Ariadne, as well as an interlocking complementarity of subject matter (Chap. 4.3). Again, in the portrayal of the collection of wood immediately before the Golden Bough episode, when the Trojans are about to build the pyre for Misenus, the poet seems to vie with Ennius, intimating that the earlier epicist is rather outmoded (Chap. 5). Shortly before the beginning of the Transitional Section, Vergil had also engaged with Homer in the first half of Book 5, where the poet expresses at one time confidence in his superiority, in the ship race, and on another occasion a degree of self-doubt or insecurity, when the older contestant defeats the boastful younger upstart in the boxing match.

Ambivalent regard-cum-rivalry *vis-à-vis* his eminent predecessors, manifested through erudite intertextual emulation, is also closely connected with Vergil's own self-image, as suggested by various evidently self-referential elements, as well as a more general metapoetic interest in the rôle of the poet as artist. Indeed, when he draws attention to Daedalus' inability to depict the loss of his son, Vergil appears to suggest that there may be incidents which are too distressing to be susceptible of expression by some artists, although at the same time, he may also be implying that he himself does not suffer from such limitations. In a number of other places, the poet also aligns himself with his own fictitious bardic characters. This is done somewhat indirectly and subtly in the first Misenus scene (Chap. 5.5), where Misenus as an outstanding trumpeter is associated with Cretheus in Book 9, both as a fellow performer and,

⁴ Intertextuality is discussed more fully in Chapter 1.1.

through a complex genealogical link, as an Aeolid. Furthermore, since Cretheus is said to sing of the arms of men (not radically different from arms and the man), the link between Misenus and Cretheus is extended to Vergil himself. Cretheus, however, is slain by the 'barbarian' Turnus, perhaps symbolizing Vergil's greatest worry, namely that of being consigned to oblivion through the efforts of jealous detractors. A similar anxiety on Vergil's part may also be seen in the episode of Misenus' death (Chap. 5.3), where the trumpeter-bard is overwhelmed by the sea, a symbol previously used by Callimachus and others to represent Homer.

Concern for his own reputation in the universe of poetic composition is also very clear not only through intertextual engagement with earlier poets, but also through Vergil's references to his own earlier poetry. In particular, references to fictitious, real, and metaphorical temples in the vatic episode with the Sibyl recall Vergil's metaphorical temple at the beginning of Book 3 of the *Georgics*. Readers are thereby invited to recognize metapoetic significance also in the interchanges with the Sibyl (Chap. 6.2), assisted through the semantic associations of the word *vates*, a designation which Vergil uses of himself in Book 7 when addressing the Muse Erato. Moreover, the 'rehabilitation' of the term *vates* also puts Vergil in contention again with both Ennius and Lucretius. In the Palinurus episode, too, there are metapoetic overtones when Aeneas' flagship guides itself towards the exiles' new homeland, just as Vergil's flagship poem is about to embark on new subject matter with the battles to be fought in that new homeland, Latium (Chap. 3.5).

In the midst of scenes of prophecy and mysticism, in which the two distinct but nevertheless related meanings of the term *vates* are blurred and accrue to confer greater authority upon the poet-*vates*, it is surprising that, despite the plethora of scholarly contributions, interpretations of the Golden Bough episode do not seem to have been extended beyond the strict context of the poem to perceive both a metapoetic significance and a generic human symbolism, in both instances the quest by an individual human being for high achievement (Chap. 6.5). As with all of the other themes discussed above, Vergil's evident concern with his rôle as a poet in these scenes also looks back to earlier parts of the poem and forward to later parts. Cretheus as a bard who, in Book 9, sings of the arms of men has already been mentioned above as a character with whom Vergil may be seen as associating himself (Chap. 5).

7.5 Overall contribution to the poem and concluding remarks

Considered as a single, coherent unit of narrative running more or less unbroken across the weak division between Books 5 and 6, the Transitional Section is remarkable in terms of both structure and poetic technique. Bringing about the change of location, mood and content necessary to pass from the relaxed atmosphere of the games in western Sicily to the solemn and didactic tone appropriate to the revelations in the Underworld following the arrival in Latium, the Transitional Section carries the main plot forward while also serving the important purposes of recapitulation and preparation. By means of recalling themes and events from the earlier part of the poem and foreshadowing their recurrence later in the poem, the Transitional Section, close to the middle of the epic, also performs the unifying function of binding together the two halves of the *Aeneid*, bringing the wanderings of the Trojans to a conclusion and heralding the battles to come in Latium after the exposition of the remote long-term future in the Underworld.

Aside from functionality, in effecting these changes the Transitional Section provides the opportunity for the poet to display many of the narrative and poetic styles employed in other places throughout the poem. Character development in both Aeneas and Ascanius is evident. Moreover, as elsewhere in the *Aeneid*, several of the scenes are marked by elements of drama in exchanges of direct speech between the characters. At the same time, Vergil demonstrates his poetic virtuosity in intertextuality and metapoetic allusion, especially in the wonderfully complex and affecting ekphrasis in the middle of the Transitional Section which mixes mythological and fictitious time with historical time.

From within the huge quantity of rich material in the Transitional Section, six features seem to be worth highlighting as standing out particularly (without implying any difference of importance in the order in which they are presented below).

Firstly, Vergil's evident understanding of the human cost of empire, and especially his sympathy for those who suffer the hardships of exile, including women, and those who die prematurely, whether or not in the context of battle, whilst at the same time representing the divinely-ordained character of the Roman imperial project.

Secondly, the possibly surprising number of scenes which, quite apart from displaying intertextual relationships, are susceptible of a metapoetic interpretation, suggesting concern on the part of Vergil for his own status and reputation as poet-*vates*.

Thirdly, Vergil's intertwining or (to use Servius' word) 'mixing' of mythology, his own fictions, and history, and the multi-dimensional perspective which he imparts to chronology, highlighting through myth the real, long-term, internecine cost which is inherent in military conquest and civil war, as well as the consequent political anxiety with which the early principate was no doubt viewed and perhaps judged by contemporaries.

Fourthly, the prominence of religious ritual and piety as an infrastructural feature, reflecting the *pax deorum* which many Romans considered to be a factor critical both for the longevity of the Roman state up to Vergil's time and for its hoped-for continuation.

Fifthly, the lively, quasi-dramatic presentation of some of the scenes, contrasting with the more straightforward narrative of the commemorative games and with the philosophical and didactic character of the journey through the Underworld.

Sixthly, and most importantly, the consummate poetic skill, culminating in the virtuosity of the Daedalus ekphrasis, with which Vergil manipulates his material and integrates it into the Transitional Section.

These features, also found elsewhere throughout the *Aeneid*, are of course only a selected few, but they seem to stand out particularly strongly in the Transitional Section. In consequence, the Transitional Section may be seen as representing a microcosm of the themes and poetic techniques of the poem as a whole, which is itself about transition, thereby constituting the Transitional Section as an integral, unifying component which makes a significant overall contribution.

Finally, it is self-evident that the section of the *Aeneid* from 5.604 to 6.261 effects a transition, carrying the poem from one physical location to another, and from a description of sporting events on the terrestrial and mortal plane to a spiritual experience, which will offer glimpses of immortality, on a much more elevated didactic and philosophical plane. Had Vergil chosen to connect the games and the visit to the Underworld by means of a relatively short and straightforward narrative account of an uneventful sea journey from Sicily to the promised land of Latium via Campania,

readers would have been deprived of an extraordinarily rich, beautiful, and moving section of recapitulation and preparation in the course of which Vergil self-consciously demonstrates his mastery of a wide range of poetic skills.

Appendix: Analysis of metrical patterns in the Daedalus ekphrasis of *Aeneid* 6

Line no.	Text	Metrical pattern	Overall incidence*	Index of 'rarity'**
14	Daedalus, ut fama est, fugiens Minoia regna	DSDS	11.2	3
15	praepetibus pennis ausus se credere caelo	DSSS	14.4	1
16	insuetum per iter gelidas enauit ad Arctos,	SDDS	5.8	8
17	Chalcidicaque leuis tandem super astitit arce.	DDSD	4.2	10
18	redditus his primum terris tibi, Phoebe, sacrauit	DSSD	5.7	9
19	remigium alarum posuitque immania templa.	DSDS	11.2	3
20	in foribus letum Androgeo; tum pendere poenas	DSDS	11.2	3
21	Cecropidae iussi (miserum!) septena quotannis	DSDS	11.2	3
22	corpora natorum; stat ductis sortibus urna.	DSSS	14.4	1
23	contra elata mari respondet Cnosia tellus:	SDSS	9.5	4
24	hic crudelis amor tauri suppostaque furto	SDSS	9.5	4
25	Pasiphae mixtumque genus prolesque biformis	DSDS	11.2	3
26	Minotaurus inest, Veneris monimenta nefandae,	SDDD	1.9	16
27	hic labor ille domus et inextricabilis error;	DDDS	6.8	6
28	magnum reginae sed enim miseratus amorem	SSDD	1.7	14
29	Daedalus ipse dolos tecti ambagesque resoluit,	DDSS	12.0	2
30	caeca regens filo uestigia. tu quoque magnam	DSSD	5.7	9
31	partem opere in tanto, sineret dolor, Icare, haberes.	DSDD	3.7	12
32	bis conatus erat casus effingere in auro,	SDSS	9.5	4
33	bis patriae cecidere manus. quin protinus omnia	DDDS	6.8	6

Key:

D = Dactyl

S = Spondee

* Overall incidence (per cent) in the *Aeneid* as a whole

** According to Duckworth: commonest pattern in the *Aeneid* = 1; least common = 16.

Sources of statistical data:

Duckworth (1969); Winbolt (1903); Lederer (1890); Drobisch (1866).

Notes:

- a. Only the first four feet of each line are taken into account, since the last two rarely deviate from the standard – ∪ ∪ | – x pattern. Spondaic lines, being few in number (twenty-four according to Duckworth), are disregarded for this purpose.
- b. Duckworth provides a ranking, but does not offer a percentage for every possible permutation. Missing data have been obtained from Lederer and Drobisch. Some minor discrepancies exist between the sources.

Bibliography

A. Commentaries and ancient texts

Note: for ancient texts not cited below, sources of texts are: (i) Perseus Collection, Greek and Roman materials; (ii) LacusCurtius; and (iii) The Latin Library; URLs respectively as follows:

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/collection?collection=Perseus:collection:Greco-Roman>

<http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/home.html>

<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com>

Vergil

Austin, R G. *Aeneidos liber sextus*, OUP, 1977.

Bonifaz Nuño, R (Ed. and trans.). *Publio Virgilio Marón: Eneida*, Universidad Autónoma de México, 2006.

Clausen, W V. *A commentary on Virgil, Eclogues*, OUP, 1994.

Coleman, R G G. *Vergil: Eclogues*, CUP, 1977.

Conington, J P (rev. Nettleship, H). *Conington's Virgil: Aeneid Books III-V*, Exeter, Bristol Phoenix Press, 2008, reprinted from part of Volume II of *Vergili Maronis opera: the works of Virgil, with a commentary by John Conington*, London, Whittaker, fourth edition revised by H Nettleship, 1884.

Conte, G B. *P Vergilius Maro: Aeneis*, Berlin, de Gruyter, 2009.

Dingel, J. *Kommentar zum 9. Buch der Aeneis Vergils*, Heidelberg, Universitätsverlag C Winter, 1997.

Fairclough, H R (Ed. and Trans.). *Virgil*, Harvard University Press, Loeb Classical Library, revised edition, 2 voll., 1935, 1934.

Fairclough, H R (Ed. and Trans.), revised by Goold, G P. *Virgil*, Harvard University Press, Loeb Classical Library, revised edition, 2 voll., 1999, 2000.

Fletcher, F. *Virgil: Aeneid VI*, OUP, 1941, reprinted with corrections 1966.

Hardie, P R. *Virgil Aeneid Book IX*, CUP, 1994.

Harvard Servius: see Rand, *et al.* (1946); Stocker, *et al.* (1965).

- Henry, J. *Aeneidea, or critical, exegetical, and aesthetical remarks on the Aeneis*, Dublin, 5 voll., 1873-89, Vol. III [Books V-IX], 1889.
- Horsfall, N M. *Virgil, Aeneid 7: a commentary*, Leiden, Brill, 1999/2000
- Horsfall, N M. *Virgil, Aeneid 11: a commentary*, Leiden, Brill, 2003.
- Horsfall, N M. *Virgil, Aeneid 3: a commentary*, Leiden, Brill, 2006 (*Mnemosyne*, Supplement 273).
- Horsfall, N M. *Virgil, Aeneid 2: a commentary*, Leiden, Brill, 2008 (*Mnemosyne*, Supplement 299).
- Horsfall, N M. *Virgil, Aeneid 6: a commentary*. Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 2013.
Vol. 1: *Introduction, text and translation*; Vol. 2: *Commentary and appendices*.
- Mynors, R A B. *P. Vergili Maronis opera*, OUP, 1969. [OCT]
- Mynors, R A B. *Virgil: Georgics*, OUP, 1990.
- Norden, E. *P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis Buch VI*, Leipzig, Teubner, 3rd edition, 1927 (reprinted, Stuttgart, Teubner, 1957: 'Vierte Auflage: (neu mit dem Text der zweiten Auflage verglichen)'; fünfte Auflage ('unveränderte'), 1970).
- Paratore, E (Ed.) and Canali, L (Trad.). *Virgilio: Eneide*, Milan, Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, Arnoldo Mondadori Editore, 6 voll., 1978-83.
- Perkell, C G. *Vergil: Aeneid Book 3*, Newburyport, MA, Focus, 2010.
- Rand, E K, et al. (Eds.). *Servianorum in Vergilii carmina commentariorum editionis Harvardianae volumen II [Aeneid 1-2]*, Lancaster (PA), American Philological Association, 1946.
- Rivero García, L, et al. (Eds. and trans.). *Eneida: Publio Virgilio Marón*, Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 4 voll., Vol. 1 (Books 1-3), 2009, Voll. 2-4 (Books 4-6, 7-9, 10-12), 2011.
- Servius: see Thilo & Hagen (1878-1902); Rand, et al. (1946); Stocker, et al. (1965).
- Stocker, A F, et al. (Eds.). *Servianorum in Vergilii carmina commentariorum editionis Harvardianae volumen III [Aeneid 3-5]*, OUP for American Philological Association, 1965.
- Tarrant, R J. *Virgil: Aeneid. Book XII*, CUP, 2012.
- Thilo, G and Hagen, H (Eds.). *Servii grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*, Leipzig/Berlin, Teubner, 3 Voll., 1878-1902. Vol 1, 1878-81: *Aeneid 1-5*; Vol. 2, 1883-4: *Aeneid 6-12*; Vol. 3, Part 1, 1887: *Eclogues and Georgics*; Vol. 3, Part 2, 1902: *Appendix Serviana*.

Thomas, R F. *Virgil: Georgics*, CUP, 2 voll., 1988. (1988b).

Williams, R D. *P. Vergili Maronis: Aeneidos Liber Quintus*, OUP, 1960

Williams, R D. *Virgil: Aeneid*, London, Macmillan, 2 voll., 1972, 1973.

Other authors and commentators

Apollonius Rhodius: see Fränkel (1967, 1968); Lachenaud (2010).

Aurelius Victor [Pseudo-]: see Richard (1983).

Bernabé, A (Ed.). *Poetae epici graeci: testimonia et fragmenta, Pars II, Fasciculus 1*,
Munich, K G Saur, 2004.

Brugnoli, G and Stok, F (Eds.). *Vitae Vergilianae antiquae*, Roma, Istituto Poligrafico
e Zecca dello Stato, 1997.

Callimachus: see Williams (1978).

Cary, E (Ed. and Trans.). *Dionysius of Halicarnassus: Roman antiquities, Books 1-2*,
Cambridge (MA), Harvard University Press, Loeb Classical Library, 1937.

Cicero, *De natura deorum*: see Plasberg (1933); Rackham (1951).

Courtney, E. *The fragmentary Latin Poets*, OUP, 1993.

Diels, H and Kranz, W. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, Zürich/Berlin,
Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 3 voll., 1964.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus: see Cary (1937).

Donatus, Aelius: see Brugnoli & Stok (1997); also Servius.

Donatus, Tiberius Claudius: see Georgii (1905-6).

Edwards, M W. *The Iliad: a commentary. Volume V: books 17-20*, CUP, 1991.

Ennius: see Skutsch (1986); Vahlen (1903).

FGrHist = *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*: see Jacoby (1923-58)

Fränkel, H. *Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica*, OUP, 1961 (corrected reprints 1964, 1967).

Fränkel, H. *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios*, Munich, C H Beck'sche
Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1968.

Georgii, C H. *Tiberi Claudii Donati: interpretationes Vergilianae*, Leipzig, Teubner, 2
voll., 1905-6.

Gowers, E. *Horace: Satires: Book I*, CUP, 2012.

Hesiod: see Most (2007).

- Heubeck, A and Hoekstra, A. *A commentary on Homer's Odyssey: Volume II: Books IX-XVI*, OUP, 1989.
- Homer: see Heubeck and Hoekstra (1989); Edwards (1991); Richardson (1993).
- Horace: see Gowers (2012).
- Jacoby, F (Ed.). *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker [FGrHist]*, Berlin/Leiden, Weidemann/Brill, 1923-58.
- Kaster, R A (Ed. and Trans.). *Macrobius: Saturnalia*, Cambridge (MA), Harvard University Press, Loeb Classical Library, 3 voll., 2011.
- Kouremenos, T, Parássoglou, G M, and Tsantsanoglou, K. *The Derveni papyrus*, Florence, Leo S Olschki Editore, 2006.
- Kurfess, A (Ed.). *C Sallusti Crispi: Catilina; Iugurtha; fragmenta ampliora*, Leipzig, Teubner, 3rd edition, 1957.
- Lachenaud, G (Ed. and Trans.). *Scholies à Apollonios de Rhodes*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 2010.
- Lucretius: see Rouse & Smith (1992).
- Macrobius: see Kaster (2011).
- Maurenbrecher, B (Ed.). *C Sallusti Crispi historiarum reliquiae. Fasciculus II: fragmenta*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1893.
- McGushin, P (Trans.). *Sallust: the histories, translated with introduction and commentary*, Volume I, OUP, 1992.
- Most, G W (Ed. and trans.). *Hesiod: The shield, Catalogue of women, other fragments*, Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Murgatroyd, P. *Tibullus: Elegies II*, OUP, 1994.
- Plasberg, O, revised Ax, W. *M Tulli Ciceronis: scripta quae manserunt omnia*, Fasc. 45: *De natura deorum*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1933.
- Rackham, H (Ed. and Trans.). *Cicero: De natura deorum; Academica*, Cambridge (MA), Harvard University Press, Loeb Classical Library, 1933, rev. 1951.
- Radt, S (Ed.). *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta (TrGF), Vol. 3: Aeschylus*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985.
- Richard, J-C (Ed. and Trans.). *Pseudo-Aurélius Victor: les origines du peuple romain*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1983.
- Richardson, N J. *The Iliad: a commentary. Volume VI: books 21-24*, CUP, 1993.

- Rolfe, J C (Ed. and Trans.). *Suetonius*, Cambridge (MA), Harvard University Press, Loeb Classical Library, 2 voll.: Vol. 1: *De vita Caesarum*: Julius-Gaius, 1913, rev. 1951; Vol. 2: *DvC*: Claudius-Domitian, *De viris illustribus*, 1914.
- Rouse, W H D and Smith, M F (Eds. and Trans.). *Lucretius*: *De rerum natura*, Harvard, Loeb, 1992.
- Sallust: see Maurenbrecher (1893); Kurfess (1957); McGushin (1992).
- Skutsch, O. *The Annals of Q. Ennius*, OUP, reprinted with corrections, 1986.
- Suetonius: see Rolfe, J C (Ed. and Trans.); also Brugnoli & Stok (1997).
- Tibullus: see Murgatroyd (1994).
- TrGF* = *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*: see Radt (1985)
- Vahlen, J. *Ennianae poesis reliquiae. Iteratis curis recensuit Iohannes Vahlen*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1903.
- Williams, F. *Callimachus*: Hymn to Apollo, OUP, 1978.

B. Modern scholarship

- Accademia Nazionale Virgiliana (Ed.). *Atti del convegno mondiale scientifico di studi su Virgilio: Mantova, Roma, Napoli, 19-24 settembre 1981*, Milan, Mondadori, 1984.
- Ambrose, Z P. 'The etymology and genealogy of Palinurus', *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 101, No. 4 (1980), pp. 449-57.
- ANRW* = *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*: see Temporini, H and Haase, W (Eds.).
- Armstrong, R. 'Crete in the *Aeneid*: recurring trauma and alternative fate', *Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 52, No. 1 (2002), pp. 321-40.
- Armstrong, R. *Cretan women: Pasiphae, Ariadne, and Phaedra in Latin poetry*, OUP, 2006.
- Arnaud, P. *Les routes de la navigation antique: itinéraires en Méditerranée*, Paris, Éditions Errance, 2005.
- Augello, G. 'Considerazioni sulla morte di Palinuro', in Boldrini, *et al.* (1987), Vol. II, pp. 411-21.
- Babcock, C L. '*Sola ... multis e matribus*: a comment on Vergil's Trojan women', in Wilhelm & Jones (1992), pp. 39-50.

Bailey, C. *Religion in Virgil*, OUP, 1935.

Bal, M G (trans. van Boheemen, C). *Narratology: introduction to the theory of narrative*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1985 [First English edition (with revisions) of: *De theorie van vertellen en verhalen*, Muiderberg, Coutinho, second edition, 1980].

Bandera, C. 'Sacrificial levels in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *Arethusa*, Vol. 14, No. 2 (1981), pp. 217-39.

Baraz, Y and van den Berg, C S. 'Intertextuality: introduction', *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 134, No. 1 (2013), pp. 1-8, with bibliography, pp. 133-48.

Barchiesi, A. 'Palinuro e Caieta: due "epigrammi" Virgiliani (*Aen* V.870 sg.; VII.1-4)', *Maia*, Vol. 31 (1979), pp. 3-11.

Barchiesi, A. *La traccia del modello: effetti omerici nella narrazione virgiliana*, Pisa, Giardini, 1984.

Barchiesi, A. 'Virgilian narrative: ecphrasis', in Martindale (1997), Chapter 17b, pp. 271-81.

Beard, W M and North, J (Eds.). *Pagan priests: religion and power in the ancient world*, London, Duckworth, 1990.

Beard, W M, North, J, and Price, S. *Religions of Rome*, 2 voll., Vol. 1: a history; Vol. 2: a sourcebook, CUP, 1998.

Behr, F D'A. 'The narrator's voice: a narratological reappraisal of apostrophe in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *Arethusa*, Vol. 38, No. 2 (2005), pp. 189-221.

Belloni, L, Milanese, G, and Porro, A (Eds.). *Studia classica Iohanni Tarditi oblata, Volume I*, Milan, Vita e Pensiero, 1995.

Bernabé, A and Jiménez San Cristóbal, A I. 'Are the "Orphic" gold leaves Orphic?', in Edmonds (2011), pp. 68-101.

Boldrini, S, et al. (Eds.). *Filologia e forme letterarie: studi offerti a Francesco della Corte. Volume secondo: letteratura latina dalle origini ad Augusto*, Università degli Studi di Urbino, 1987.

Braund, S M. 'Virgil and the cosmos: religious and philosophical ideas', in Martindale (1997), pp. 204-21.

Braund, S M. 'Speech, silence and personality: the case of Aeneas and Dido', *Proceedings of the Virgil Society*, Vol. 23 (1998), pp. 129-147.

- Bremmer, J N. 'Scapegoat rituals in Ancient Greece' *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 87 (1983), pp. 299-320.
- Bremmer, J N. 'The Golden Bough: Orphic, Eleusinian, and Hellenistic-Jewish sources of Virgil's Underworld in *Aeneid* VI', *Kernos*, Vol. 22 (2009), pp. 183-208.
- Bremmer, J N. 'Post scriptum: Virgil and Jewish literature', *Vergilius* 59 (2013), pp. 157-64.
- Bremmer, J N and Horsfall, N M. *Roman myth and mythography*, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, Supplement 52 (1987).
- Brenk, F E. 'Vnum pro multis caput: myth, history, and symbolic imagery in Vergil's Palinurus incident', *Latomus*, Vol. 43 (1984), pp. 776-801.
- Brenk, F E. 'Wind and waves, sacrifice and treachery: Diodoros, Appian and the death of Palinurus in Vergil', *Aevum*, Vol. 62, No. 1 (1988), pp. 69-80.
- Briggs, W W. 'The similes of *Aeneid* 5', in Wilhelm & Jones (1992), pp. 157-66.
- Brooks, R A. 'Discolor aura. Reflections on the Golden Bough', *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 74, No. 3 (1953), pp. 260-80.
- Buchheit, V. *Der Anspruch des Dichters in Vergils Georgika: Dichtertum und Heilsweg*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972.
- Burkert, W. *Homo necans: Interpretationen altgriechischer Opferriten und Mythen*, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1972.
- Burkert, W (trans. Bing, P). *Homo necans: the anthropology of ancient Greek sacrificial ritual and myth*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1983.
- Cameron, A. *Callimachus and his critics*, Princeton University Press, 1995.
- Campbell, J (Ed.). *The Mysteries: papers from the Eranos yearbooks, Volume 2*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1955.
- Camps, W A, *An introduction to Virgil's Aeneid*, OUP, 1969.
- Cancik, H, Schneider, H, and Landfester, M (Eds.). *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*, Stuttgart, Verlag J B Metzler, 16 voll. in 19 bound units, 1996-2003.
- Carney, E D. 'City-founding in the *Aeneid*', in Deroux (1986), pp. 422-30.
- Casali, S. 'Aeneas and the doors of the Temple of Apollo', *Classical Journal*, Vol. 91, No. 1 (1995), pp. 1-9.
- Casali, S. [Review of Dekel (2012)], *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2012.
- Casali, S. [Review of Horsfall (2013)], *Vergilius*, Vol. 60 (2014), pp. 165-72.

- Casson, L. 'Speed under Sail of Ancient Ships', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 82 (1951), pp. 136-48.
- Casson, L. *Ships and seamanship in the ancient world*, Princeton University Press, 1971.
- Catto, B A. 'The labyrinth on the Cumaean gates and Aeneas' escape from Troy', *Vergilius*, Vol. 34 (1988), pp. 71-6.
- Chaniotis, A (Ed.). *From Minoan farmers to Roman traders: sidelights on the economy of ancient Crete*, Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999.
- Clark, R J. 'Misenus and the Cumaean landfall: originality in Vergil's use of topography and tradition', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 107 (1977), pp. 63-71. (1977a).
- Clark, R J. 'Vergil, *Aeneid*, 6, 40 ff. and the Cumaean Sibyl's cave', *Latomus*, Vol. 36 (1977), pp. 482-95. (1977b).
- Clark, R J. *Catabasis: Vergil and the wisdom-tradition*, Amsterdam, B R Grüner, 1978/9.
- Clark, R J. 'Vergil, *Aeneid* 6: the bough by Hades' gate', in Wilhelm & Jones (1992), pp. 167-78.
- Clarke, M J, Currie, B G F, and Lyne, R O A M (Eds.). *Epic interactions: perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the epic tradition, presented to Jasper Griffin by former pupils*, OUP, 2006.
- Clausen, W V. *Virgil's Aeneid: decorum, allusion, and ideology*. Munich, Saur, 2002.
- Coleman, R G G. 'The gods in the *Aeneid*', *Greece and Rome*, Second series, Vol. 29, No. 2 (1982), pp. 143-68.
- Connolly, C V. *The unquiet grave*, London, Hamish Hamilton, Revised edition, 1945.
- Conte, G B. *Memoria dei poeti e sistema letterario*, Turin, Einaudi, 1974.
- Conte, G B. *Virgilio, il genere e i suoi confini*, Milan, Garzanti, enlarged second edition, 1984 [first edition: 1980].
- Conte, G B. *The rhetoric of imitation: genre and poetic memory in Virgil and other Latin poets*, Ithaca (NY), Cornell University Press, 1986.
- Conte, G B. 'The Virgilian paradox: an epic of drama and sentiment', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, Vol. 45 (1999), pp. 17-42.
- Cormier, R J. 'Qui détient le Rameau d' Or devant Charon? (Enéide, VI. 405-407)', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, New series, Vol. 131 (1988), pp. 151-6.

- Cormier, R J. 'Who bears the Golden Bough before Charon? (*Aeneid* VI, 405-7) – a correction,' in Deroux (2005), pp. 173-84.
- Cowan, R. 'Hopefully surviving: despair and the limits of *devotio* in Virgil and others', *Proceedings of the Virgil Society*, Vol. 27 (2011), pp. 56-98.
- Cox, F. 'Envoi: the death of Virgil', in Martindale (1997), pp. 327-36.
- Cozzoli, U, *et al.* (Eds.). *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, Rome, Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 6 voll., 1984-91.
- D' Anna, N. *Publio Nigidio Figulo: un pitagorico a Roma nel I° secolo a. C.*, Milan, Archè - Edizioni PiZeta, 2008.
- Dekel, E. *Virgil's Homeric lens*, New York/London, Routledge, 2012.
- della Corte, F. *La mappa dell' Eneide*, Florence, Nuova Italia, 1972.
- Deremetz, A. *Le miroir des Muses: poétiques de la réflexivité à Rome*, Villeneuve d'Ascq (Nord), Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 1995.
- Deroux, C (Ed.). *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History IV*, Brussels, Latomus, 1986, pp. 422-30.
- Deroux, C (Ed.). *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History XII*, Brussels, Latomus, 2005, pp. 173-84.
- Dewar, M J. 'The gods in epic' [review of Feeney (1991)], *Classical Review*, New series, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 61-3.
- Dinter, M T. 'Epic and epigram – minor heroes in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *Classical Quarterly*, New series, Vol. 55, No. 1 (2005), pp. 153-69.
- Doob, P R. *The idea of the labyrinth from Classical Antiquity through the Middle Ages*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Drobisch, M W. 'Ein statistischer Versuch über die Formen des lateinischen Hexameters', *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig: philologische-historische Classe*, Vol. 18, pp. 75-139, Leipzig, S Hirzel, 1866.
- duBois, P. *History, rhetorical description and the epic*, Cambridge, D S Brewer, 1982.
- Duckworth, G E. *Vergil and classical hexameter poetry: a study in metrical variety*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1969.
- Dyson, J T: see Hejduk, J T.

- Edmonds, R G. *The 'Orphic' gold tablets and Greek religion: further along the path*, CUP, 2011.
- Edmunds, L. *Intertextuality and the reading of Roman poetry*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.
- Edmunds, L. 'Critical divergences: new directions in the study and teaching of Roman literature', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 135 (2005), pp. 1-13.
- Edwards, C H. *Writing Rome: textual approaches to the city*, CUP, 1996.
- Edwards, C H. *Death in ancient Rome*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2007.
- Elsner, J. 'Cult and sculpture: sacrifice in the *Ara Pacis Augustae*', *Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 81 (1991), pp. 50-61 and Plates I-VII.
- Elsner, J (Ed). *Art and text in Roman culture*, CUP, 1996.
- Enciclopedia Virgiliana*: see Cozzoli, et al. (Eds.).
- Erasmus, M. *Reading death in ancient Rome*, Columbus, Ohio State University Press, 2008.
- Evjen, H D. *Mnemai: classical studies in memory of Karl K Hulley*, Chico, CA, Scholars Press, 1984.
- Farrell, J A. *Vergil's Georgics and the traditions of ancient epic: the art of allusion in literary history*, OUP, 1991.
- Farrell, J A. 'The Virgilian intertext', in Martindale (1997), pp. 222-38.
- Farrell, J A. 'Aeneid 5: poetry and parenthood', Chapter 5 in Perkell (1999), pp. 96-110.
- Farrell, J A. 'La ricompensa di Palinuro', *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica*, 4th Series, Vol. 6, No. 1 (2008), pp. 5-18.
- Farrell, J A and Putnam, M C J (Eds.). *A companion to Vergil's Aeneid and its tradition*, Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Feeney, D C. 'The taciturnity of Aeneas', *Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 1 (1983), pp. 204-19.
- Feeney, D C. 'History and revelation in Vergil's underworld', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, Vol. 32 (1986), pp. 1-24.
- Feeney, D C. *Literature and religion at Rome*, CUP, 1988
- Feeney, D C. *The gods in epic*, OUP, 1991

- Feldherr, A. 'Ships of state: *Aeneid* 5 and Augustan circus spectacle', *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 14, No. 2 (1995), pp. 245-265.
- Fitzgerald, W. 'Aeneas, Daedalus and the labyrinth', *Arethusa*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (1984), pp. 51-65.
- Fitzgerald, W. *Catullan provocations: lyric poetry and the drama of position*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1995.
- Fitzgerald, W and Gowers, E (Eds.). *Ennius perennis: the Annals and beyond*, *Cambridge Classical Journal*, Supplementary Volume 31, 2007.
- Fletcher, K F B. 'Amphrysia vates (*Aeneid* 6.398)', *Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 62, No. 2 (2012), pp. 863-5.
- Fowler, D P. 'Deviant focalisation in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, Vol. 36 (1990), pp. 42-63.
- Fowler, D P. 'Narrate and describe: the problem of ekphrasis', *Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 81 (1991), pp. 25-35.
- Fowler, D P. 'Modern literary theory and Latin poetry: some Anglo-American perspectives', *Arachnion* [online], No. 2 (1995).
- Fowler, D P. 'Even better than the real thing: a tale of two cities', in Elsner (1996), pp. 57-74.
- Fowler, D P. 'The Virgil commentary of Servius', in Martindale (1997), Chapter 5, pp. 73-8 (1997a).
- Fowler, D P. 'On the shoulders of giants: intertextuality and classical studies', *Materiali e Discussioni*, No. 39 (1997), pp. 13-34 (1997b).
- Fowler, D P. 'Virgilian narrative: story-telling', in Martindale (1997), Chapter 17a, pp. 259-70 (1997c).
- Fowler, D P. *Roman constructions: readings in postmodern Latin*, OUP, 2000.
- Fratantuono, L. 'A brief reflection on the Gates of Sleep', *Latomus*, Vol. 66, No. 3 (2007), pp. 628-35.
- Fratantuono, L. 'Graviter commotus: Neptune in the *Aeneid*', *Latomus*, Vol. 74, No. 1 (2015), pp. 130-48.
- Frazer, J G. *The Golden Bough: a study in magic and religion*, Part VII, Vol. II, London, Macmillan, third edition, 1913.

- Freud, S (trans. Strachey, J, *et al.*). *The standard edition of the complete works of Sigmund Freud*, London, The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psycho-analysis, Vol. VI (1901), 1960, Vol. XIII (1913-14), 1958.
- Freud, S (trans. Strachey, J, *et al.*). *The psychopathology of everyday life* [first published 1901, subsequently enlarged several times up to 10th edition 1924], in Freud (1958/60), Vol. VI.
- Freud, S (trans. Strachey, J, *et al.*). *Totem and taboo* [first published 1912-13], in Freud (1958/60), Vol. XIII, pp. [vii]-162.
- Gaisser, J H. [Review of Feeney (1991)], *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 03.02.08, 1992.
- Gale, M R. 'The shield of Turnus (*Aeneid* 7.783-92), *Greece & Rome*, Vol. 44, No. 2 (1997), pp. 176-96.
- Galinsky, G K. *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*, Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Galinsky, G K. 'The anger of Aeneas', *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 109, No. 3 (1988), pp. 321-48.
- Galinsky, G K. 'Aeneas at Cumae', *Vergilius*, Vol. 55 (2009), pp. 69-87.
- Genette, G (trans. Lewin, J E). *Narrative discourse*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1980 [first published in French, 1972].
- Girard, R (trans. Gregory, P). *Violence and the sacred*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977 [first published in French, 1972].
- Giusti, E. [Untitled review of Horsfall (2013)], *Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 105 (2015), pp. 432-4.
- Glare, P G W (Ed.). [=OLD2E]. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, OUP, second edition, 2 Voll., 2012.
- Gnoli, G and Vernant, J-P (Eds.). *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes*, CUP and Paris, Éditions de la Maison des Sciences de l' Homme, 1982.
- Goins, S. 'Two aspects of Virgil's use of *labor* in the *Aeneid*', *Classical Journal*, Vol. 88, No. 4 (1993), pp. 375-84.
- Goldberg, S M. [Review of Thomas & Ziolkowski (2014)], *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2014.
- Goldhill, S. 'What is ekphrasis for?', *Classical Philology*, Vol. 102, No. 1 (2007), pp. 1-19.
- Goldhill, S. [Review of Webb (2009)], *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2009.

- Graf, F. 'Text and ritual: the Corpus Eschatologicum of the Orphics', in Edmonds (2011), pp. 53-67 [updated version of article published in 2000].
- Green, C M C. 'The slayer and the king: *Rex Nemorensis* and the sanctuary of Diana', *Arion*, Third series, Vol. 7, No. 3 (2000), pp. 24-63.
- Griffin J. *Latin poets and Roman life*, London, Duckworth, 1985.
- Griffin, J. *Virgil*, OUP, 1986.
- Hall, E and Wyles, R (Eds.). *New directions in ancient pantomime*, OUP, 2008.
- Hardie, A. 'The *Georgics*, the mysteries and the muses at Rome', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, Vol. 48 (2002), pp. 175-208.
- Hardie, P R. *Virgil's Aeneid: cosmos and imperium*, OUP, 1986.
- Hardie, P R. 'Augustan poets and the mutability of Rome', in Powell (1992), pp. 59-75.
- Hardie, P R. *The epic successors of Virgil*, CUP, 1993.
- Hardie, P R. 'Virgil and tragedy', in Martindale (1997), pp. 312-26.
- Hardie, P R. *Virgil: Greece & Rome, new surveys in the classics*, No. 28, OUP, 1998.
- Hardie, P R (Ed.). *Virgil: critical assessments of classical authors*, London, Routledge, 4 voll., 1999.
- Hardie, P R. *The last Trojan hero: a cultural history of Virgil's Aeneid*, London, I B Tauris, 2014.
- Harrison, E L. 'The structure of the *Aeneid*: observations on the links between the books', in *ANRW* II.31.1 (1980), pp. 359-93.
- Harrison, S J. 'Vergilian similes: some connections', *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar*, Vol. 5 (1985), pp. 99-107.
- Harrison, S J (Ed.). *Oxford readings in Vergil's Aeneid*, OUP, 1990.
- Harrison, S J. 'Vergil and the *Mausoleum Augusti*: *Georgics* 3.12-18', *Acta Classica*, Vol. 48 (2005), pp. 185-8.
- Harrison, S J. 'The epic and the monuments: interactions between Virgil's *Aeneid* and the Augustan building programme', in Clarke, *et al.* (2006), pp. 159-83.
- Harrison, S J. 'The primal voyage and the ocean of epos', *Dictynna*, Vol. 4 (2007).
<http://dictynna.revues.org/146>
- Harvey, *et al.* (1993): see Heinze (1993) and (1999).
- Haslam, M W. 'Aiolos' cousin', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Vol. 88 (1991), pp. 297-9.

- Heinze, R. *Virgils epische Technik*, Leipzig, Teubner, third edition, 1915.
- Heinze, R. *Die augusteische Kultur von Richard Heinze, herausgegeben von Alfred Körte*, Leipzig/Berlin, Teubner, 1930 [collection of lectures given in 1918 and 1921, published posthumously].
- Heinze, R (trans. Harvey, H & D and Robertson, F). *Virgil's epic technique*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1993.
- Heinze, R (trans. Harvey, H and D, and Robertson, F). *Virgil's epic technique*, London, BCP, second edition, 1999 [same pagination as 1993 edition, but with the addition of an Index of citations].
- Hejduk, J T [formerly Dyson]. 'Caesi iuveni and Pietas impia in Virgil', *Classical Journal*, Vol. 91, No. 3 (1996), pp. 277-86.
- Hejduk, J T [formerly Dyson]. *King of the Wood: the sacrificial victor in Virgil's Aeneid*, Norman (OK), University of Oklahoma Press, 2001.
- Hejduk, J T [formerly Dyson]. 'Facing the Minotaur: *Inception* (2010) and *Aeneid* 6', *Arion*, 3rd Series, Vol. 19, No. 2 (2011), pp. 93-104.
- Herrero de Jáuregui, M. 'Traditions of catabatic experience in Aeneid 6', *Études Classiques*, Vol. 83 (2015), pp. 329-49.
- Heslin, P. *The Museum of Augustus: the Temple of Apollo in Pompeii, the Portico of Philippus in Rome, and Latin poetry*, Los Angeles, The J Paul Getty Museum, 2015.
- Hightet, G A. *The speeches in Vergil's Aeneid*, Princeton University Press, 1972.
- Hinds, S E. ' "Proemio al mezzo": allusion and the limits of interpretability', *Materiali e Discussioni*, No. 39 (1997), pp. 113-22.
- Hinds, S E. *Allusion and intertext: dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry*, CUP, 1998.
- Holstein, J F. *Rites and ritual acts as prescribed by the Roman religion according to the commentary of Servius on Vergil's Aeneid*, New York, Voelcker Bros., 1916.
<http://archive.org/details/ritesritualactsa00holsrich>
- Holt, P. 'Aeneid V: past and future', *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 75, No. 2 (1979/80), pp. 110-21.
- Holzberg, N. [Review of Thomas & Ziolkowski (2014)], *Gymnasium online supplement*, 2014.
- Hommages à Georges Dumézil*, Brussels, Collection Latomus, Vol. 45, 1960.

- Hope, V M. *Roman death: the dying and the dead in ancient Rome*, London and New York, Continuum, 2009.
- Horsfall, N M. 'Varro and Caesar: three chronological problems', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, Vol. 19 (1972), pp. 120-8.
- Horsfall, N M. 'Stesichorus at Bovillae?', *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 99 (1979), pp. 26-48 and Plates II-IIIc.
- Horsfall, N M. 'The Aeneas-Legend from Homer to Virgil', in Bremmer & Horsfall (1987), pp. 12-24.
- Horsfall, N M. *Virgilio: l' epopea in alambicco*, Naples, Liguori Editore, 1991.
- Horsfall, N M (Ed.). *A companion to the study of Virgil*, Leiden, Brill, 1995 (*Mnemosyne*, Supplement 151).
- Horsfall, N M. 'Virgil and the Jews', *Vergilius*, Vol. 58 (2012), pp. 67-80.
- Horsfall, N M. *The epic distilled: studies in the composition of the Aeneid*, OUP, 2016.
- Hornblower, S and Spawforth, A J S (Eds.). [= *OCD4E*] *The Oxford classical dictionary*, OUP, fourth edition, 2012.
- Hubaux, J. 'Misène', *Antiquité Classique*, Vol. 2 (1933), pp. 135-64.
- Hubert, H and Mauss, M. 'Essai sur la nature et la fonction du sacrifice', *L' Année Sociologique*, Vol. 2 (1897-1898), pp. 29-138. [Published 1899].
- Hubert, H and Mauss, M (trans. Halls, W D). *Sacrifice: its nature and function*, London, Cohen & West, 1964.
- Hughes, D D. *Human sacrifice in ancient Greece*, London, Routledge, 1991.
- Jacob, P. 'L' épisode de Palinure', *Études Classiques*, Vol. 20 (1952), pp. 163-7.
- Jenkyns, R. *Virgil's experience: nature and history: times, names, and places*, OUP, 1998.
- Jocelyn, H D. 'Varro's *Antiquitates rerum divinarum* and religious affairs in the late Roman republic', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, Vol. 65, No. 1 (1982), pp. 148-205.
- Jocelyn, H D. 'Poeta and Vates: concerning the nomenclature of the composer of verses in republican and early imperial Rome', in Belloni, *et al.* (1995), pp. 19-50.
- Johnson, W R. *Darkness visible: a study of Vergil's Aeneid*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1976.

- Jung, C G (trans. Hull, R F C). *Symbols of transformation*, London, Routledge, 1956 [translated from fourth German edition, 1952]; Vol. 5 of *The collected works of C G Jung*.
- Jung, C G (trans. Hull, R F C). *Psychology and religion: west and east*, second edition, London, Routledge, 1969 [translated from 1954 German edition]; Vol. 11 of *The collected works of C G Jung*.
- Kehoe, P E. 'Was Book 5 once in a different place in the Aeneid?', *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 110, No. 2 (1989), pp. 246-63.
- Keith, A M. *Engendering Rome: women in Latin epic*, CUP, 2000.
- Kirk, G S. 'Some methodological pitfalls in the study of ancient Greek sacrifice (in particular)', in Rudhardt & Reverdin (1981), pp. 41-90.
- Knight, W F J. *Roman Vergil*, London, Penguin, 1st edition 1944, revised edition published posthumously 1966.
- Koch, H-A. 'Zum Verständnis von Vergil, Aeneis 6, 205 ff.', *Wiener Studien*, Vol. 181 (Neue Folge, 2), 1968, pp. 70-3.
- Kofler, W. *Aeneas und Vergil: Untersuchungen zur poetologischen Dimension der Aeneis*, Heidelberg, Universitätsverlag Winter, 2003.
- Köves-Zulauf, T. 'Die Steuermänner im Gesamtrahmen der Aeneis: Leucapsis, Menoetes, Palinurus', *Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis*, Vol. 34-35 (1998/99), pp. 303-25.
- Kyriakidis, S. *Narrative structure and poetics in the Aeneid: the frame of Book 6*, Bari, Levante Editori, 1998.
- Laird, A. 'Vt figura poesis: writing art and the art of writing in Augustan poetry', in Elsner (1996), pp. 75-102.
- Lane Fox, R J. *Travelling heroes: Greeks and their myths in the epic age of Homer*, London, Allen Lane, 2008.
- Lange, C H. *Res publica constituta: Actium, Apollo and the accomplishment of the triumphal assignment*, Leiden, Brill, 2009.
- Leach, E W. 'Viewing the *spectacula* of Aeneid 6', Chapter 6 in Perkell (1999), pp. 111-27.
- Lederer, S. 'Ist Vergil der Verfasser von Culex und Ciris? Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Hexameters', *Jahres-bericht über das KK Akademische Gymnasium in Wien*, 1890, pp. 14-30.

- Lee, M O. 'Seven suffering heroines and seven surrogate sons', in Wilhelm & Jones (1992), pp. 82-92.
- Lee, M O. *The olive-tree bed and other quests*, University of Toronto Press, 1997.
- Leigh, M. 'Hopelessly devoted to you: traces of the Decii in Vergil's *Aeneid*', *Proceedings of the Virgil Society*, Vol. 21 (1993), pp. 89-110.
- Liberman, G. 'The new Teubner *Aeneid*', *Classical Review*, New series, Vol. 62, No. 1 (2012), pp. 149-51 [Review of Conte (2009)].
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 'The cousin of Aiolos Hippotades (Stesichorus (?) P.Oxy. 3876, Fr. 62)', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Vol. 87 (1991), pp. 297-300. (1991a).
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 'Odysseus' cousin: a reply to Professor Haslam', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Vol. 89 (1991), p. 37. (1991b).
- Lovatt, H V. 'Statius, Orpheus, and the post-Augustan *vates*', *Arethusa*, Vol. 40, No. 2 (2007), pp. 145-63.
- Luck, G. 'Virgil and the mystery religions', *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 94, No. 2 (1973), pp. 147-66.
- Lyne, R O A M. *Further voices in Vergil's Aeneid*, OUP, 1987.
- Lyne, R O A M. *Words and the poet*, OUP, 1989.
- Mackie, C J. *The characterisation of Aeneas*, Edinburgh, Scottish Academic Press, 1988.
- MacLennan, K. 'Humour in Virgil', *Proceedings of the Virgil Society*, Vol. 27 (2011), pp. 1-13.
- Maiuri, A. ' "Horrendae secreta Sibyllae". Scoperta dell' antro cumano', *Associazione Internazionale degli Studi Mediterranei: Bollettino*, Vol. 3, No. 3 (1932), pp. 21-9.
- Maiuri, A. *Itinerario flegreo* [selected articles commemorating the 20th anniversary of his death], Naples, Bibliopolis, 1983.
- Martindale, C A. *Redeeming the text: Latin poetry and the hermeneutics of reception*, CUP, 1993.
- Martindale, C A (Ed.). *The Cambridge companion to Virgil*, CUP, 1997.
- McAuley, M. *Reproducing Rome: motherhood in Virgil, Ovid, Seneca, and Statius*, OUP, 2016.

- McKay, A G. 'Aeneas' landfalls in Hesperia', *Greece & Rome*, Vol. 14, No. 1 (1967), pp. 3-11.
- McKay, A G. *Cumae and the Phlegraean fields: Ancient Campania, Volume I*, Hamilton, Ontario, Vergilian Society, 1972.
- McKay, A G. 'Vergilian heroes and toponymy: Palinurus and Misenus', in Evjen (1984), pp. 121-37.
- Michels, A K. 'The golden bough of Plato', *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 66, No. 1 (1945), pp. 59-63.
- Miles, G B. 'The *Aeneid* as foundation story', in Perkell (1999), pp. 231-50.
- Miller, J F. *Apollo, Augustus, and the poets*, CUP, 2009.
- Miller, P A. 'The Minotaur within: fire, the labyrinth, and strategies of containment in *Aeneid* 5 and 6', *Classical Philology*, Vol. 90, No. 3 (1995), pp. 225-40.
- Miniconi, P. 'La joie dans l' *Énéide*', *Latomus*, Vol. 21 (1962), pp. 563-71.
- Mohler, S L. 'Sails and oars in the *Aeneid*', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 79 (1948), pp. 46-62.
- Momigliano, A. 'The theological efforts of the Roman upper classes in the first century BC', *Classical Philology*, Vol. 79, No. 3 (1984), pp. 199-211.
- Monaco, G. *Il libro dei ludi*, Palermo, Palumbo, second edition, 1972.
- Montanari, E. *Roma: momenti di una presa di coscienza culturale*, Rome, Bulzoni Editore, 1976
- Murgia, C E. 'Why is the APA/Harvard Servius?: Editing Servius', paper delivered to the American Philological Association, 2004.
<http://escholarship.org/uc/item/89p134jb>
- Murrin, M. *The allegorical epic: essays in its rise and decline*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Nelis, D. *Vergil's Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*, Leeds, Francis Cairns, 2001.
- Neue Pauly, Der*: see Cancik, H, et al. (Eds.).
- Newman, J K. *The concept of vates in Augustan poetry*, Brussels, Latomus 89, 1967.
- Nicoll, W S M. 'The sacrifice of Palinurus', *Classical Quarterly*, New series, Vol. 38, No. 2 (1988), pp. 459-72.

- Nugent, S G. 'Vergil's "Voice of the women" in *Aeneid* V', *Arethusa*, Vol. 25, No. 2 (1992), pp. 255-92.
- Nugent, S G. 'The women of the *Aeneid*: vanishing bodies, lingering voices', in Perkell (1999), pp. 251-70.
- O' Hara, J J. *Death and the optimistic prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid*, Princeton University Press, 1990.
- O' Hara, J J. *Inconsistency in Roman epic: studies in Catullus, Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid and Lucan*, CUP, 2007.
- OCD4E: see Hornblower, S and Spawforth, A J S (Eds.).
- OED2E: see Simpson, J A and Weiner, E S C (Eds.).
- OLD2E: see Glare, P G W (Ed.).
- Oliensis, E. 'Freud's *Aeneid*', *Vergilius*, Vol. 47 (2001), pp. 39-63.
- Oliensis, E. *Freud's Rome: psychoanalysis and Latin poetry*, CUP, 2009.
- Otis, B. *Virgil: a study in civilized poetry*, OUP, 1964
- Panayotakis, C. 'Virgil on the popular stage', in Hall & Wyles (2008), pp. 185-97.
- Panoussi, V. 'Aeneas' sacral authority', in Farrell & Putnam (2010), pp. 52-65
- Parke, H W. *Sibyls and Sibylline prophecy in classical antiquity*, London, Routledge, 1988.
- Parry, A. 'The two voices of Virgil's *Aeneid*', *Arion*, Vol. 2, No. 4 (1963), pp. 66-80.
- Pârvolescu, A. 'The Golden Bough, Aeneas' piety, and the suppliant branch', *Latomus*, Vol. 64, No. 4 (2005), pp. 882-909.
- Paschalis, M. 'The unifying theme of Daedalus' sculptures on the temple of Apollo Cumanus (*Aen.* 6.20-33)', *Vergilius*, Vol. 32 (1986), pp. 33-41.
- Paschalis, M. *Virgil's Aeneid: semantic relations and proper names*, OUP, 1997.
- Pauly, *Der neue*: see Cancik, H, et al. (Eds.).
- Pavlock, B. [Review of Feeney (1991)], *Classical Philology*, Vol. 88, No. 3 (1993), pp. 251-4.
- Pavlovskis-Petit, Z. 'Aeneid V: the old and the young', *Classical Journal*, Vol. 71, No. 3 (1976), pp. 193-205.
- Perkell, C G (Ed.). *Reading Vergil's Aeneid: an interpretive guide*, Norman (OK), University of Oklahoma Press, 1999.
- Petrain, D E. *Homer in stone: the Tabulae Iliacae in their Roman context*, CUP, 2014.

- Powell, A (Ed.). *Roman poetry and propaganda in the age of Augustus*, London, Bristol Classical Press, 1992.
- Powell, A. *Virgil the partisan: a study in the re-integration of Classics*, Swansea, Classical Press of Wales, 2008.
- Préaux, J-G. 'Virgile et le rameau d' or', in *Hommages à Georges Dumézil* (1960), pp. 151-67.
- Putnam, M C J. *The poetry of the Aeneid*, Cambridge (MA), Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Putnam, M C J. 'The hesitation of Aeneas', in *Accademia Nazionale Virgiliana* (1984), pp. 233-52.
- Putnam, M C J. 'Daedalus, Virgil and the end of art', *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 108, No. 2 (1987), pp. 173-98.
- Putnam, M C J. 'Virgil's Danaid ekphrasis', *Illinois Classical Studies*, Vol. 19 (1994), pp. 171-89.
- Putnam, M C J. 'Ganymede and Virgilian ekphrasis', *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 116, No. 3 (1995), pp. 419-40. (1995a).
- Putnam, M C J. 'Silvia's stag and Virgilian ekphrasis', *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, No. 34 (1995), pp. 107-33. (1995b).
- Putnam, M C J. *Virgil's Aeneid: interpretation and influence*, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1995. (1995c).
- Putnam, M C J. 'Dido's murals and Virgilian ekphrasis', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 98 (1998), pp. 243-75. (1998a).
- Putnam, M C J. *Virgil's epic designs: ekphrasis in the Aeneid*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1998. (1998b).
- Putnam, M C J. 'Epic statements', *Arion*, Third series, Vol. 6, No. 3 (1999), pp. 204-16.
- Quinn, K. *Virgil's Aeneid: a critical description*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968.
- Quint, D. *Epic and empire: politics and generic form from Virgil to Milton*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Rawson, E D. *Intellectual life in the late Roman republic*, London, Duckworth, 1985.
- Reed, J D. *Virgil's gaze: nation and poetry in the Aeneid*, Princeton (NJ), Princeton University Press, 2007.

- Reitz-Joosse, B L. *Building in words: representations of the process of construction in Latin literature*, University of Leiden, unpublished doctoral thesis, 2013, seen courtesy of the author, expected to be the basis of a monograph to be published by OUP in the USA in 2017.
- Rieks, R. 'Die Gleichnisse Vergils', in *ANRW II.31.2* (1981), pp. 1011-1110.
- Rogerson, A I. *Reading Ascanius and the Aeneid*, University of Cambridge unpublished doctoral thesis, 2005, consulted at the University Library.
- Rogerson, A I. *Virgil's Ascanius: imagining the future in the Aeneid*, CUP, forthcoming 2017.
- Rudhardt, J and Reverdin, O (Eds.). *Le sacrifice dans l'antiquité: huit exposés suivis de discussions [25-30 août 1980]*, Vandœuvres (Geneva), Fondation Hardt, 1981.
- Rutledge, H C. 'Vergil's Daedalus', *Classical Journal*, Vol. 62, No. 7 (1967), pp. 309-11.
- Rutledge, H C. 'The opening of Aeneid 6', *Classical Journal*, Vol. 67, No. 2 (1971/2), pp. 110-5.
- Sadurska, A. *Les Tables Iliques*, Warsaw, PWN – Éditions Scientifiques de Pologne, 1964.
- Salanitro, M. 'Il vischio virgiliano', *Res Publica Litterarum*, Vol. 20 (1997), pp. 49-53.
- Scafoglio, G. 'Virgilio e Stesicoro: una ricerca sulla *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina*', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, Vol. 148 (2005), pp. 113-27. (2005).
- Scheid, J. *La religion des Romains*, Paris, Armand Colin/Masson, 1998.
- Scheid, J (Trans. Lloyd, J). *An introduction to Roman religion*, Edinburgh University Press, 2003.
- Schein, S L. *The mortal hero: an introduction to Homer's Iliad*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1984.
- Schnapp-Gourbeillon, A. 'Les funérailles de Patrocle', in Gnoli & Vernant (1982), pp. 77-88.
- Schoder, R V. 'Vergil's poetic use of the Cumae area', *Romanitas*, Vol. 9 (1970), pp. 187-98.
- Schoder, R V. 'Vergil's poetic use of the Cumae area', *Classical Journal*, Vol. 67, No. 2 (1971/2), pp. 97-109.
- Schofield, M. 'Cicero for and against divination', *Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 76 (1986), pp. 47-65.

- Schreiber, T (trans. Anderson, W C F). *Atlas of classical antiquities*, London, Macmillan, 1895.
- Scullard, H H. *Festivals and ceremonies of the Roman republic*, London, Thames and Hudson, 1981
- Seaford, R. *Reciprocity and ritual: Homer and tragedy in the developing city-state*, OUP, 1994.
- Segal, C P. 'Aeternum per saecula nomen, the golden bough and the tragedy of history: Part I', *Arion*, Vol. 4, No. 4 (1965), pp. 617-57.
- Segal, C P. 'Aeternum per saecula nomen, the golden bough and the tragedy of history: Part II', *Arion*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (1966), pp. 34-72.
- Segal, C P. 'The hesitation of the Golden Bough: a reexamination', *Hermes*, Vol. 96, No. 1 (1968), pp. 74-9.
- Seider, A M. *Memory in Vergil's Aeneid: creating the past*, CUP, 2013.
- Shatzman, I. 'Religious rites in Virgil's writings', *Scripta Classica Israelica*, Vol. 1 (1974), pp. 47-63.
- Simpson, J A, and Weiner, E S C (Eds.). [=OED2E]. *The Oxford English dictionary*, OUP, 2nd edition, corrected, 20 Voll., 1991.
- Smith, R A. *The primacy of vision in Virgil's Aeneid*, Austin, University of Texas Press, 2005.
- Smith, R M. 'Deception and sacrifice in *Aeneid* 2.1-249', *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 120, No. 4 (1999), pp. 503-23.
- Smith, R U. 'The Pythagorean letter and Virgil's Golden Bough', *Dionysius*, Vol. 18 (2000), pp. 7-23.
- Solmsen, F. ' "Aeneas founded Rome with Odysseus" ', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 90 (1986), pp. 93-110.
- Sparrow, J H A. *Half-lines and repetitions in Virgil*, OUP, 1931.
- Squire, M. *The Iliad in a nutshell*, OUP, 2011.
- Stilp, F. *Mariage et suovetaurilia: étude sur le soi-disant 'Autel de Domitius Ahenobarbus'*, Rome, Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, 2001.
- Suerbaum, W. 'Hundert Jahre Vergil-Forschung: eine systematische Arbeitsbibliographie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der *Aeneis*', in *ANRW* II.31.1 (1980), pp. 3-358.

- Tarrant, R J. 'Aspects of Virgil's reception in antiquity', in Martindale (1997), pp. 56-72.
- Temporini, H and Haase, W (Eds.). [= ANRW] *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Berlin and New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1972-
- Thaniel, G. 'Ecce Palinurus', *Acta Classica*, Vol. 15 (1972), pp. 149-52.
- Thomas, R F. 'Virgil's ecphrastic centerpieces', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 87 (1983), pp. 175-84.
- Thomas, R F. 'Tree violation and ambivalence in Virgil', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 118 (1988), pp. 261-73. (1988a).
- Thomas, R F and Ziolkowski, J M (Eds.). *The Virgil encyclopedia*, Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 3 voll., 2014.
- Torelli, M. *Typology and structure of Roman historical reliefs*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1982.
- Toynbee, J M C. *Death and burial in the Roman world*, London, Thames and Hudson, 1971.
- Valenzuela Montenegro, N. *Die Tabulae Iliacae: Mythos und Geschichte im Spiegel einer Gruppe frühkaiserzeitlicher Miniaturreliefs*, Berlin, dissertation.de -- Verlag im Internet GmbH, 2004.
- Vernant, J-P. 'Théorie générale du sacrifice et mise à mort dans la θυσία grecque', in Rudhardt & Reverdin (1981), pp. 1-39.
- Versnel, H S. 'Self-sacrifice, compensation and the anonymous gods', in Rudhardt & Reverdin (1981), pp. 135-94.
- Virgil encyclopedia (The)*: see Thomas & Ziolkowski (Eds.).
- Webb, R. *Ekphrasis, imagination and persuasion in ancient rhetorical theory and practice*, Farnham, Ashgate Publishing, 2009.
- Weber, C. 'The allegory of the golden bough', *Vergilius*, Vol. 41 (1995), pp. 3-34.
- West, D A. 'The bough and the gate: seventeenth Jackson Knight memorial lecture; delivered at the University of Exeter on 24 October 1986', University of Exeter, 1987.
- West, D A. 'The bough and the gate', in Harrison (1990), pp. 224-38.
- Wilhelm, R M and Jones, H (Eds.). *The two worlds of the poet: new perspectives on Vergil*, Detroit, Wayne State University Press, 1992

- Wili, W. 'The Orphic mysteries and the Greek spirit', in Campbell (1955), pp. 64-92 [first published 1944].
- Wilkins, E G. 'A classification of the similes in Vergil's *Aeneid* and *Georgics*', *Classical Weekly*, Vol. 14, No. 22 (1921), pp. 170-4.
- Williams, G W. *Technique and ideas in the Aeneid*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1983
- Williams, R D. 'The sixth book of the *Aeneid*', *Greece and Rome*, Second series, Vol. 11, No. 1 (1964), pp. 48-63.
- Wills, J. *Repetition in Latin poetry: figures of allusion*, OUP, 1996.
- Wiltshire, S F. 'Omnibus est labor: Vergil and the work of the classics', *Classical Journal*, Vol. 80, No. 1 (1984), pp. 1-7.
- Winbolt, S E. *Latin hexameter verse: an aid to composition*, London, Methuen, 1903.
- Wiseman, T P. *Roman drama and Roman history*, University of Exeter Press, 1998.
- Yona, S. 'Food for the road: a closer look at the significance of *dapes* in the funeral of Misenus', *Vergilius*, Vol. 58 (2012), pp. 53-65.
- Zarker, J W. 'Aeneas and Theseus in *Aeneid* 6', *Classical Journal*, Vol. 62, No. 5 (1967), pp. 220-6.

Table 3: Descriptions of components of sacrifice in the *Aeneid*

Book	Lines	Attendees (principal or celebrant first)	Victim(s)/offering	Comments	Noteworthy vocabulary
I	632-6	Dido; Aeneas, Trojans, Carthaginians	20 bulls, 100 pigs, 100 sheep	<i>Suovetaurilia</i> would be possible (?)	<i>indicit honorem</i>
II	132-3	Calchas; Greeks	Sinon	Fictitious escape	<i>salsae fruges; vittae</i>
	201-2; 221	Laocoön; Aeneas, Trojans	Huge bull	Aeneas is more observer than participant	<i>sacerdos; mactabat; aras; vittas</i>
III	19-21	Aeneas; Trojans	Bull		<i>mactabam</i>
	66-8	Aeneas; Trojans	Not stated	Burial of Polydorus	<i>sanguinis ... sacri</i>
	80-1	Anius	Not stated	Implied that Anius was sacrificing	<i>sacerdos; vittis; sacra ... lauro</i>
	118-20	Anchises; Aeneas, Trojans	Two bulls, black sheep, white sheep		<i>aris; mactavit</i>
	278-80	Aeneas; Trojans	Not stated	Purification rite	<i>incendimus; aras</i>
	367-73	Helenus; Aeneas	Bullocks	<i>de more</i>	<i>caesis; vittas; sacerdos</i>
	403-9	Helenus; Aeneas	--	Helenus' instructions to Aeneas	<i>aris; velare comas</i>
	543-7	Aeneas; Trojans	Not stated	Fulfilling Helenus' instructions <i>rite</i>	<i>aras; velamur; adolemus</i>
IV	56-61	Dido; Anna	Sheep, white cow	<i>de more</i>	<i>aras; mactant; exta</i>
	198-202	Iarbas	Sheep		<i>templa; aras; ignem</i>
	634-40	Dido	Sheep	<i>rite</i> ; but a deception	<i>vitta</i>
V	72-9; 94-103	Aeneas; Acestes, Ascanius, Trojans	Two sheep, two pigs, two black bullocks	double <i>suovetaurilia</i> ; <i>rite</i> ; <i>de more</i>	<i>velat; sanguine sacro; caedit; mactant; veribus; viscera</i>
	735-6	[Intended participants:] Sibyl; Aeneas	Black sheep	Anchises' instructions to Aeneas	<i>sanguine</i>
	772-6	Aeneas; Trojans	Three bullocks and a sheep	Departure from Drepanum	<i>caedere; foliis evinctus olivae; exta</i>

Table 3: Descriptions of components of sacrifice in the *Aeneid*

Book	Lines	Attendees (principal or celebrant first)	Victim(s)/offering	Comments	Noteworthy vocabulary
VI	152-53	Aeneas	Black sheep	Sibyl's instructions to Aeneas for funeral	<i>piacula</i>
	243-54	Sibyl, Aeneas; Trojans	Four black-backed bullocks, a black sheep, sterile cow	Holocaust sacrifice	<i>sacerdos, ignibus; supponunt ... cultros; aras; viscera; extis</i>
VII	92-3	Latinus; attendants	100 sheep	<i>rite</i>	<i>mactabat</i>
	173-6	Laurentine kings/nobles; Latins	Rams	Description of Latinus' palace	<i>caeso</i>
VIII	81-5	Aeneas; Trojans	White sow and piglets	The omen prophesied by Helenus	<i>mactat; sacra ferens; ad aram</i>
	102-6	Evander, Pallas; Aeneas, Arcadians, Trojans	Not stated		<i>tura; cruor fumabat ad aras</i>
	179-83	Priest; Evander, Aeneas, Arcadians, Trojans	Bulls	Sacrifice evidently performed a little earlier	<i>araeque sacerdos; viscera tosta; extis</i>
	273-84	Potitius; Arcadians, Aeneas, Trojans	Not stated	Sacrifice evidently performed a little earlier	<i>cingite fronde comas; velavitque comas; sacerdotes; aras</i>
	541-5	Aeneas, Evander; Arcadians, Trojans	Sheep	<i>de more</i>	<i>ignibus; aras; mactat</i>
IX	--	--	--	--	--
X	537-9	Aeneas	Haemonides	Rôle reversal; in battle	<i>sacerdos; infula; vitta; immolat</i>
XI	197-9	Aeneas, Tarchon; Trojans, allies	Bulls, pigs, sheep	Mass funeral; <i>suovetaurilia</i> (?)	<i>mactantur; iugulant</i>
XII	116-20; 166-74; 212-5	Priest; Aeneas, Ascanius, Turnus, Trojans, Rutulians, Latins	Piglets, unshorn sheep, cattle	Solemnization of treaty; <i>rite</i>	<i>aras; ignem; velati; limo; verbena ... vincti; sacerdos; fruges ... salsas; iugulant; visceris</i>